

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR.

No. 454.

NEW SERIES.

No. 64.

# THE MONTH

*A Catholic Magazine.*

---

APRIL, 1902.

---



---

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

---

LONDON :  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.  
BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND Co.  
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROTHERS.

---

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

# Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools.

*Edited by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J.*

**COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK.** By the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s. 6d.

This volume forms one of the Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools, which, while intended primarily to meet the requirements of the Local Examinations, are also adapted for general use in schools, and will be found serviceable by all who wish to acquire an intelligent understanding of the historical books of the New Testament.

**St. Matthew.** By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s. 6d.

**St. Luke.** By the Rev. J. W. DARBY, O.S.B., and the Rev. SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J. Crown 8vo, 296 pp., boards, with Map, 2s. 6d.

**St. John.** By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s.

**Acts. Part I. (Chapters i.—xvi.).** By the Very Rev. T. A. BURGE, O.S.B. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 2s.

**Acts. Part II. (Chapters xiii.—xxviii.).** By the Very Rev. T. A. BURGE, O.S.B. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, boards, with Map, 1s. 6d.

Most serviceable for Teachers, and an admirable Gift-Book  
for First Communicants.

## FIRST COMMUNION.

EDITED BY

FATHER THURSTON, S.J.

### Third and Cheaper Edition.

Crown 8vo, 496 and xxiv. pp., with 19 Illustrations.

**PRICE 3s. 6d.**

LONDON: BURNS & OATES (LIMITED), 28, ORCHARD STREET, W.







## "Realities at Home."

---

TWENTY years ago, the public conscience in London was stirred by a pamphlet, entitled *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London*. It had an enormous sale; it formed the text of numerous sermons, in and out of pulpits; it inaugurated a school of literature; "slumming" became a fashionable amusement; young ladies in drawing-rooms no longer "prattled of evolution," but, at a safe distance, evinced a keen, if fleeting interest, in the condition of the poor. The "lapsed masses," "the submerged tenth," and kindred phrases, were in every one's mouth; and various panaceas were proposed for the divers diseases from which those so designated suffered. Religious bodies, ethical societies, educational agencies, labour unions, the Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society, and numerous others that might be named, entered with enthusiasm upon the work of civilizing and elevating "the masses." The penny pamphlet was, as has been said, the forerunner of a flood of literature, some of it sensational, much of it ephemeral, but including at least one monumental work, the result of three years' (1886—8) patient investigation—Mr. Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the Poor in London*. From that time until the present there has been a steady output of books dealing with every aspect of the social question; fiction has been pressed into the service; statistics have been compiled with assiduous ingenuity; the claims of civilization and "culture" have been urged upon those to whom religion did not appeal. And these efforts have been no more confined to London than are the circumstances which have called for them. In all our large towns—notably in Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool, as well as in Glasgow and Edinburgh—we have had exposures of the deplorable circumstances in which so many of the people live; pamphlets have been written—often illustrated from photographs—showing that in the sad competition, the claim of London to be in the forefront will not be allowed to pass unchallenged.

Twenty years is an appreciable portion of time; it is more

than a fourth of our allotted span—more than a third of our working days. What has been the result, then, we may ask, of the numerous movements in the direction of improving the condition of the people which were set on foot twenty years ago or thereabouts? That there is yet much to be done is manifest enough, as it is equally manifest that very few are troubling themselves to do it. Yet ignorance can no longer be pleaded as an excuse for the indifference which the more fortunate classes manifest as a whole towards their less happily circumstanced brethren; for ignorance, where it exists, can hardly be exempt from culpability.

An answer to the question asked above is in great measure supplied by the first of a series of essays which have lately been brought together in a volume which should be in the hands of all who would know something of the conditions in which a vast number of their fellow-citizens live.<sup>1</sup> The essays themselves afford valuable texts for writing on the "clean slate" which a leading statesman has been urging us to obtain and use. "Efficiency," his first requirement, is the cry of the volume as a whole; "Housing" and "Temperance" have chapters to themselves; and "Education" is the main subject of the essay on "The Children of the Town." It might indeed almost be supposed that Lord Rosebery had the contents of this volume in view when he was specifying what he would write on his slate; his omission to mention the book would in that case be explained by the fact that the essay upon "Imperialism" is on lines which would hardly meet with his lordship's approval.

It would be easy to show the importance of each of these items of a programme which must affect Catholics in a very special manner, on account of the large proportion of the very poor who are children of the Church. Of efficiency, indeed, we have all come to see the absence and to feel the necessity during the last three years; education is and must be a burning question, so long as voluntary schools are handicapped by the denial of their just share of support, and so long as English statesmen withhold from Ireland the higher education save on terms which she will not and cannot accept. Housing and temperance—how many thousands of our people are affected by the want of these! But what is likely to be done with regard to the former, apart from the inherent difficulties of the case,

<sup>1</sup> *The Heart of the Empire*. Fisher Unwin. New and Popular Edition. 2s. 6d.

when the leader of the House of Commons forgets, until reminded by a colleague who had the matter in charge, that he had ever undertaken to push it forward ; and with regard to the latter when, as has been conclusively shown by Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell in their moderate and unexaggerated presentment of *The Temperance Problem*, the legislature of the country is largely controlled by those who are interested in "the trade" ?

But in this paper I wish to confine myself to a notice of the introductory essay by Mr. C. F. G. Masterman—an essay of some fifty pages, entitled "Realities at Home." It is the work of one intimately acquainted with the general aspect and bearings of things as they are ; one who is neither a pessimist, a crank, nor a fanatic—all of them, by the way, terms which are often applied unthinkingly and indiscriminately to those whose conclusions, however extreme, are based on knowledge far more intimate than is possessed by their critics. But Mr. Masterman is not extreme: he aims at presenting things as he sees them, and would not, I think, be displeased if it could be shown that his view was exaggerated or inaccurate, though unfortunately it is neither the one nor the other.

Without a tinge either of sensationalism or exaggeration, Mr. Masterman has a singularly realistic style, and his essay from beginning to end is, to employ a somewhat doubtful compliment—"as interesting as a novel." He sees what those who are old enough and who possess a seeing eye cannot fail to have observed, the vast changes which have come over the people as a whole during the last fifty, and especially during the last twenty-five, years of the nineteenth century. He does not ignore that "in many respects great improvements" have taken place ; he gives credit for advances in sanitation, in education, in various aspects of temporal welfare. But he sees a new city type "reared in the courts and crowded ways of the great metropolis, in cramped physical accessories, and a fretful life, and long hours of sedentary toil" ; and in this type he sees "the problem of the coming years."

The following extract, however, shows a yet more serious aspect of this new development—an aspect of which no one even slightly acquainted with the class depicted can doubt the truth :—

A change more vital and more ominous for the future is widely attested by those familiar with this new City type: the almost universal decay, amongst these massed and unheeded populations of

any form of spiritual religion. . . . The spiritual world, whether in Nature, in Art, or in definite Religion, has vanished, and the curtain of the horizon has descended round the material things and the pitiful duration of human life. In former time in England, for better or worse, the things of the earth were shot with spiritual significance; heaven and hell stretched out as permanent realities; "the kingdom of all the world" rose up as "the theatre of man's achievements" and "the measure of his destiny." To-day amongst the masses of our great towns God is faintly apprehended as an amiable but absentee ruler; heaven and hell are passing to the memories of a far-off childhood, the one ceasing to attract, the other to alarm. The full effect of this change has yet to be demonstrated; but certain results are already discernible. An increasing craving for material satisfaction before the night cometh which will close all, and a fiercer refusal to endure hardship and privation during the lean years, and a concentration on the purely earthly outlook of a commercial Imperialism, heedless of abstract spiritual ideas, will be some of the least results of this change in human character.

As I have said, Mr. Masterman is not pessimistic, or perhaps it would be more correct to say that he does not ignore such upward tendencies as he is able to discern. But he shows conclusively that the panaceas advocated with enthusiasm twenty years back have failed in their aim. "Slumming," indeed, could not have been expected to lead to any lasting result; the spasmodic efforts at promoting "culture" among the masses were not likely to succeed: but the call of the "settlement" movement promised better things, and seemed to have in it the elements of permanence. Yet Mr. Masterman realizes "that the call has failed."

The failure is not, of course, complete. Toynbee Hall and Oxford House, the prototypes and pioneers of the movement, continue their work, which is excellent of its kind. As an educational centre, Toynbee Hall has done good service in the past, and still retains much of its influence; but its pupils are largely drawn, not from the poor in its immediate surroundings, but from the respectable and professional classes living in the suburbs and from the teachers under the London School Board. There is, indeed, a certain amount of local work; the weekly smoking debates are well attended by genuine working men, and I hear that a club for rough lads is popular and well managed. But even those who have been associated with the work from the first and are still zealous in its promotion,

confess their disappointment with the results ; and the number of classes held diminishes rather than increases.

Oxford House, I understand, holds its own. It seemed to me, when I was better acquainted with the working of these two settlements than I am now, that it was far more successful than Toynbee as a *local* centre of influence. There was more of the human element about it ; it was for many years under the headship of the present Bishop of London, and had the advantage of the help of the Rev. James Adderley—two important elements of success. The religious element was never obtruded, but it was there ; whereas at Toynbee it has always been aggressively ignored, ethics and culture being substituted for it, with a vague preaching of the "something within us not ourselves that makes for righteousness."

Mr. Masterman puts the present position of things with his usual straightforwardness :—

The Universities and the cultured classes, as a whole, care little about the matter. The wave of enthusiasm which created the modern settlement has ceased to advance. . . . In all the London settlements, among over four millions of toilers, there are not a hundred resident male workers ; of these many will stay for less than a year's residence. . . . I can see but little sign of any wide extension, of the increase of settlements now existing, or of the immediate multiplication of their number. The movement as a whole hangs fire, the difficulty of attracting the right followers seems increasing ; a new shaking of the pillars of society appears necessary, some upheaval of thought, wave of common enthusiasm, or realization of national peril, to induce numbers again to interest themselves in a life so far removed from their own as the life of the manual labourer. . . . There appears little sign of any great awakening of stimulus and sacrifice which will renovate the settlements already existing and perpetually create new ones.

The deduction which Mr. Masterman draws from his presentment of the existing state of affairs is a remarkable one : "the great and enduring utility of the settlement movement lies, in my opinion, in its reaction upon the Churches:" and he further develops this view by saying :

When every church is not only a place of Sunday worship, but also in its multifarious activities and offer of service a real settlement, then the admirers of the settlements can well reconcile themselves to see their own particular scheme merged in a wider ideal. *Back, then, the observer must come to the Churches themselves—to the actual*

machinery that here and now is grappling adequately or inadequately with the universal drift downwards which is characteristic of the progress of the mass.

It is true that his examination of the actual result of the efforts of the various religious bodies does not afford Mr. Masterman much comfort ; but he recognizes that there is at any rate "an actual machinery" which is capable of doing good work, and an element of permanence that is lacking to extra-ecclesiastical efforts. He sums up with what he modestly calls "attempted impartiality," "the work of religious bodies in dealing with this new problem." Among these bodies he places first the Catholic Church ; and it is worth while to extract in its entirety the paragraph he devotes to the consideration of our work and position :

The Roman Catholic Church is doing heroic work among the very poorest. Her schools, on which so much effort has been expended, are in many respects models of their kind. They educate the poorest of the poor—many who are refused on various pretexts admission to the State Elementary Schools—children of Protestant parents, hatless, bootless, half-starved. They are for the most part carried on in a spirit of devotion beyond all praise. But the Roman Catholic Church is too hopelessly submerged by the mere weight of numbers to be any effective influence beyond the limits of its own immediate adherents. Its priests are few and hard driven ; its regular Orders show a singular disinclination to throw themselves into work in the congested districts. The lay element is almost completely absent. The sympathies of the Church are democratic ; the devotion of many of the poorer Irish and others to their religion, their attendance at Mass, and their offerings from scanty earnings, is enough to put to shame richer and more prominent organizations ; the work is emphatically "of God." Few who know anything of the life of the slum will be found to join in the shameful parrot-cry of "No Popery !" which has disturbed the minds of wealthy and languid individuals in a different quarter of life. But the paucity of numbers, both workers and adherents, leaves the body with but little influence upon the general life of the crowd ; at present there appears but scanty possibility of such an increase of either as to materially affect the grave questions of the future of the city race.

Catholics have little to complain of in this estimate of their position, which contrasts on the whole favourably with that given by Mr. Masterman of the Established Church and the Nonconformist bodies. Exception may, perhaps, be taken to the criticism of the "regular Orders," so far, at any rate, as nuns

are concerned; for "their work in congested districts" is beyond all praise. Moreover, an order is bound by its rules, and although these impressed Cardinal Wiseman strongly with their "want of elasticity and the power of adaptation," it is difficult to see how they are to be set aside.

But once more our weak spot is pointed out: "the lay element is almost completely absent." This is the way in which our position strikes an outsider: how far is it true?

I think it will be allowed that, certain as it is that much more might be done by lay folk than is done, there is more activity among them than there was—say, twenty years ago. And it must also be conceded that our position with regard to social work has enormously improved. We have now, for example, flourishing Boys' Homes, not only in London, but in other great centres; the Catholic Guardians' Association spreads a network through the land; the Catholic Social Union, by means of its clubs and even more through its Ladies' Settlements, is making steady progress; the Association of the Ladies of Charity, which has existed little more than a year, numbers some hundreds of women, and has already yielded excellent results; the Boys' Brigades and other associations on the same lines continue to prosper. These and other bodies consist mainly of the laity, working of course in cordial co-operation with the clergy. To them may be added certain older associations, such as the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and the Young Men's Societies; while the number of clubs, sodalities, confraternities, and the like, existing independently of these, is considerable.

Yet in the aggregate it cannot be contended that the labourers are in anything like due proportion to the harvest that has to be gathered in. Mr. Masterman, we think not intentionally, deals mainly with the work of men; and if, in the sentence we have quoted, we take "the lay element" among ourselves as referring to men, we shall find his statement only too true.

Take the Catholic Social Union. The list of "teachers and instructors teaching in the clubs" in the Report for 1900 contains 17 names—15 women and 2 men. The number of lady workers in the clubs is 60, that of men 7; even an "Association of Catholic Young Men" is run by a lady!—; the number of members on the registers of the Clubs is 1674, of whom 242 are under male supervision. Only three Boys' Clubs



are managed by men—those at Kensal New Town, Notting Hill, and Tower Hill.

The Society of St. Vincent de Paul is the male analogue of the Ladies of Charity, and has existed in this country, I believe, about sixty years. The Report for 1900 of "works among the young" stands thus :

Children wholly or partially supported in orphanages, 143 (a loss of 124); boys and youths under patronage, 4,756 (a loss of 997); boys taught in Sunday school, 3,413 (a loss of 737); adults attending clubs or classes assisted by the Society, 140 (a loss of 628). . . . Several excellent works have been unavoidably closed. The club at Birkenhead and the Working Boys' Home at Sunderland have ceased, and several Conferences no longer register the attendance of boys at them.

For some of these decreases—*e.g.*, of the children in orphanages—a satisfactory explanation is forthcoming; but it is to be noted that no single case of increase of work among the young in any direction is recorded.

Out of the 34 London Conferences (including both sides of the river) only six have "boys under care of Patronage" [*i.e.*, the unfortunately-named branch of the Society which specially undertakes works among boys]—Battersea, 50; Commercial Road, 100; Forest Gate, 30; Rotherhithe, 172; Silvertown, 40; Southwark, 80—472 in all. Of these the Rotherhithe lads belong to the Boys' Brigade, so do the Southwark boys. Small as is the London aggregate, it is an advance upon that of the last two years, and thus so far satisfactory. The Boys' Brigades are largely organized by laymen, and their numbers, which I have not been able to ascertain, would considerably augment the total. But if we take our two most representative bodies combining spiritual with social work, we shall find that the total number of boys under their charge is 714, and that there are only 9 centres of work, situate very far apart, six in the north and three in the south of the river. "The almost complete absence of the (male) lay element" may well strike the impartial observer.

I have spoken of this as social work, but every one knows that its spiritual side is its most important feature. In the Boys' Brigade the results from the point of view of religion have been most satisfactory: and every one who has engaged in club work on right lines knows how, almost insensibly, attendance at Mass follows upon attendance at the club. Thus



the highest encouragement awaits those who will devote themselves to the work.

How are the laity to be stirred up to take their share in the work of bringing the people "back to the Churches"? This is the problem we have to face. So far it cannot be said—the statistics given above show this only too clearly—that laymen as a body have been stirred by the earnest appeals which have been made by the Cardinal and others for their help. These appeals have removed the excuse of ignorance which might at one time have been pleaded; and it is idle to suppose that lesser influences will succeed where the Cardinal has failed.

Yet it may be that an appreciation such as that of Mr. Masterman may act as a stimulus. The sympathy and the encouragement of onlookers has stimulated many an athlete to renewed efforts ending in success: and this outside testimony to the "heroic work" of the Church may urge others to take their share in it. That "the work is emphatically 'of God,'" we have been told more than once, and in burning words, by him to whom has been given the headship over the Church in this land; "the shameful parrot-cry of 'No Popery'" is not likely to disturb us. But of this we may be sure—every effort we make for those to whom we are bound by the ties of religion will react upon those from whom we are separated in belief: and if we would bring "back to the Church" our country so long estranged from it, we cannot pave the way better than by doing what we can to help our less fortunate brethren to keep the same path. "Whilst we have time let us work good to all men, but especially to those who are of the household of the Faith."

JAMES BRITTEN.

## *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus.*

### III.—THE SUPPRESSION IN FRANCE (2).

WE have seen what forces were leagued together soon after the middle of the eighteenth century for the destruction of the Society in France. We have now to see these forces at work. It is the Jansenist party, as represented by the Parlement of Paris, that eternal enemy of the French Jesuits, which we shall find throughout in the forefront of the assault. Indeed, had we not learnt from the facts already indicated what were the feelings regarding the Society of the Royal Concubine and her agents, and of the Philosophers, we might have failed to perceive their part in the campaign. It is recognized, however, by all the historians of the period—d'Alembert, Lacroix, Schoell, Sismondi, Caumont, Henri Martin, and others—that they were active interveners behind the scenes, now encouraging the Parlement to courses on which otherwise it would not have dared to venture; now using their social and literary influence to work up a public opinion favourable to their designs; now practising on the weak will of the monarch and staying his hand, when his better feelings and the instances of his family were urging him to check the excesses of the Parlement by an exercise of the Royal authority. It is in this sense that M. de Carne writes: "From the time of the quarrel over the Confession tickets to the destruction of the Society of Jesus, Madame de Pompadour was the ally of whom men said least and thought most."<sup>1</sup> And we may detect the traces of her and Choiseul's intervention in the alternations of the King's active opposition and passive submission to the measures taken by the Parlement.

Two or three men alone [says d'Alembert], who did not appear to be of the sort destined to create such a revolution, imagined and accomplished this great project, and the impulse given to the entire body of the magistrates was their work and the fruit of their impetuous activity.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Revue des Deux Mondes*, livr. January 15th, 1859, p. 313, "La Monarchie de Louis XV."

<sup>2</sup> *Sur la Destruction des Jésuites*, Edinburgh Edition of 1765, p. 127.

In view of this judgment of a discerning contemporary observer, it may be helpful to know something of the personalities that played the principal part in the events. Of the Marquise de Pompadour sufficient has been said already, and likewise of Choiseul, who became the principal Minister in 1758. Besides these, there were in the Ministry the Duc de Praslin, a cousin and submissive follower of Choiseul, and Berryer. This latter had been Intendant de Police from 1747 to 1757, and in that capacity had placed his services at the disposal of Madame de Pompadour, discovering those who spoke or wrote against her, and contriving to have them put into the Bastille or otherwise punished. When the nation could no longer stand him as head of the police, the favourite caused him to be promoted to the Ministry, in which he and Choiseul were her leading instruments to do her behests. Among the Parlementaires, Rolland, Chauvelin, de Terray, l'Averdy, and Omer Joly de Fleury were the most conspicuous.

Rolland d'Erceville was quite a young man, not thirty years of age, when the attack on the Society began, but he had attained to the degree of a President in the Court of *Enquêtes*. He was from the first a bitter enemy of the Jesuits, and threw himself heart and soul into all the proceedings against them. We shall not have occasion to refer to him much, but he was the Commissioner appointed in several instances to report on their affairs for the Parlement. His own idea of the part he played in the proceedings, and of the spirit in which he acted, may be gathered from a letter written some years later, in which he protested against a will which had left away from him some money he had expected, apparently on the ground that he was not considered by his relative to be sufficiently Jansenistic. "The affair of the Jesuits alone," he pleaded, as sufficient evidence of the injustice of his relative's suspicions, "cost me more than six hundred thousand *livres* of my own money, and in truth the labours I have undertaken especially in reference to the Jesuits, who would not have been suppressed if I had not devoted so much time, health, and money to the cause, ought not to have brought down upon me this disinheriting by my uncle." He meant that he made these sacrifices in the course of his endeavours to influence public opinion by pamphlets and otherwise—hardly a recommendation in a magistrate whose duty was to approach the case impartially.

The Abbé Chauvelin had been before the public some years, and combined in himself the double character of a *coryphæus* among the Jansenists and a friend of the Philosophers. As a Jansenist he had been foremost in resisting the Archbishop of Paris when he tried to enforce the obedience due to the Bull *Unigenitus*, and in causing the Parlement to persecute the priests who did their duty by refusing sacraments to the Appellants. He had also paid the penalty of this resisting, having been imprisoned by the King in the fortress of St. Michel—all which as a matter of course he attributed to the Jesuits. His antagonism to the Jesuits was therefore of long standing, and his sour and fierce temper made it exceptionally bitter. He was in fact just the sort of man who, if the Parlement had been animated by any sort of desire to be impartial, would have been told to stand aside, whereas he was allowed to take a part so leading that popular estimation regarded him as the chief author of the ruin of the Society.<sup>1</sup>

If the Abbé Chauvelin was a fiery and fanatical partizan, the Abbé de Terray was a man without any principles at all, or morals either. Like Chauvelin, he was unsightly in person. That indeed was his infirmity, but, says the *Dictionnaire de Biographie Nationale Universelle*:<sup>2</sup>

He supplied for the want of ease and grace in conversation by a cynicism of speech and action quite in keeping with his satyr-like body, and thereby obtained a character for grotesque originality which, being sustained by considerable genius, was as effective as the opposite qualities could have been in winning for him social success.

In earlier days he had affected the character of a zealous and austere magistrate, but since 1753, when he inherited a fortune, he threw off restraints and became notorious for his loose morals, particularly for his open adulteries, first with Madame de Clercy and afterwards with the Baronne de la Garde. He was a man of undoubted capacity and industry, and with an iron frame on which no excess of work could tell, but the aim and object of all his labours was personal aggrandisement and enrichment, and in the prosecution of these he was absolutely unscrupulous. "He did not know," says

<sup>1</sup> Hence the couplet in which allusion is made to his personal deformity, for he was a hunchback, as well as to the lameness of St. Ignatius:

Que fragile est ton sort, Société perverse,  
Un boiteux t'a fondée, un bossu te renverse.

<sup>2</sup> *Sub voc.*

M. Henri Martin, "the difference between justice and injustice, though he understood very well the difference between the possible and the impossible."<sup>1</sup> At the time with which we are concerned, he was a resolute asserter of the privileges of the Parlement as against the Crown; a decade later he was to be, in company with de Maupeou, also a Parlementaire and adversary of the Society in 1761, the ready instrument of the Crown in accomplishing the entire suppression of the Parlement by Royal authority. In between these two dates, that is, in 1763, his friend l'Averdy was appointed Controller of the Finances, and Terray became associated with him, or rather ruled him, in the management of that department of Government, to which also he succeeded in 1769. It was during this period that he acquired the evil reputation as a rapacious and unscrupulous administrator that has made his name infamous in French history.

When he died at Paris in 1778 [says the *Dictionnaire de Biographie Universelle*], he carried with him to the grave the hatred of the families his operations had ruined, and the contempt which the scandal of his morals had universally inspired. He may, in fact, be classed with Richelieu, Soubise, La Vrillière, Jarente, &c., in the number of those courtiers and ecclesiastics who, under Louis XV., contributed the most to the degradation of the Monarchy, by setting up triumphant vice by the side of the throne.

To Clement de l'Averdy we have already referred as having been promoted, in 1763, to the Control of Finances. He showed no capacity in that office and had soon to quit it, amidst the censures of the many who had been ruined by his unjust schemes for raising money. Probably, however, as has been said, he suffered in this for the iniquity of the Abbé de Terray, who dominated him. He seems to have been a more honest man than the others mentioned as having been associated with him in the campaign against the Society, but probably he was also less influential.

Of Omer Joly de Fleury, less seems to be known. He was *Avocat-General* to the Parlement, and as such was the spokesman of the *Gens du Roi*<sup>2</sup> in some of the *comptes-rendus* in which the charges against the Society were contained, but the blame for them may have lain more with others than with him.

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire de France jusqu' en 1789*, xvi. p. 275.

<sup>2</sup> By this name were known the *Procureur-Général*, the *Avocat-Général*, and their respective staffs. Nominally they represented the Crown at the bar of the Parlement, but in fact they received the impulse to act from the Parlement rather than the Crown.

It is notorious how, whilst its foes were preparing for an attack on the Society, the misbehaviour of one of its own sons lent them a most convenient pretext. Among its many important missions there was one at Martinique—an island of the Antilles, belonging then as now to France—over which Père Antoine de Lavalette presided as Superior and Procurator. In the first article of this series it has been explained how, without in the least incurring the stigma of clerical trading, the Fathers in charge of a mission might have to engage in large transactions of buying and selling on behalf of the natives. Père de Lavalette, however, not only did this but went further. Finding the mission revenues inadequate, and seeing around him vast tracts of new land capable of profitable cultivation, he bought them for this purpose, and by so doing distinctly contravened the Church's prescriptions. He had no authorization to act thus from his superiors in Europe, as we know from his own confession,<sup>1</sup> and the latter seem to have been in ignorance of what he was doing until the catastrophe occurred. Apparently the remoteness of the Antilles and the extent of his legitimate operations afforded a cover for what would not have been permitted if known. On the other hand he enjoyed the cordial approval of the French Governor of the colony, who, in 1753, when some complaints of his conduct reached the Ministry of Marine at Paris, wrote a strong letter in his defence. Nor as long as we view his conduct from the sole standpoint of commercial morality, does it seem to have been censurable, for it was apparently business on a sound footing, and Père de Lavalette certainly enjoyed the confidence of those he dealt with in Europe. In 1755, however, war broke out between England and France, and he was the victim of its very first act. Five of his ships were taken by the English privateers and the sum thus lost to him in goods and specie amounted to about two millions of *livres*.<sup>2</sup> He was thus left in a bankrupt condition, and his creditors in Europe were in consequence involved in grave difficulties. Chief among these were the firms of Lioncy and Gouffre at Marseilles, and Grou and Son of Nancy, who called upon Père de Sacy, the Procurator-General of the French Missions, resident in the Professed House at Paris, to honour his colleague's bills of exchange. They also

<sup>1</sup> Cretineau Joly, *Clement XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 120, gives the text of this confession.

<sup>2</sup> A *livre* was approximately of the same value as a *franc*.

represented the state of affairs to the French Provincial and to the General. The reply given was that Père de Sacy had received no remittances from Martinique from which he could draw, but that they would strive their utmost to meet the debts of that mission, although unable to accept responsibility in the name of their other houses, each house of the Society being financially independent—which they undoubtedly were according to the law of the Society and the terms of their respective deeds of foundation, as ratified by the laws both of Church and State. This last plea has appeared indefensible to the friends as well as to the foes of the Society who have written on the subject, but is not unintelligible even if it was injudicious in view of the circumstances. It must be remembered that with the exception of the Professed Houses which were but three in number throughout France at that time, and subsisted solely on the alms collected day by day, the property of the Society consisted mainly of colleges founded by various benefactors, which were therefore the Society's property only in a limited sense. The deeds of foundation assigned certain purposes to which the revenues were to be devoted, such as the education of extern pupils, or in some cases of the Society's own younger members, and the Society, though it had the administration of all, was entitled to apply to its own uses only such sums as were required for the suitable maintenance of the necessary staffs. It is this, doubtless, that the Fathers had in mind in disclaiming responsibility save for the Martinique Mission, but it is certain that, without any pressure on the part of the courts, they would have refused no self-sacrifice, and would eventually have succeeded in paying off the very last item of Père de Lavalette's debts. As it was they set to work earnestly to grapple with the occasion, and, having paid off at once the more necessitous of the creditors out of their funds in hand, proceeded to borrow a sum of two millions of *livres* on a mortgage of their properties in Martinique and St. Domingo, properties which, had it not been for the capture of these islands shortly after by the English, would when realized have more than covered the amount of the loan. Divided counsels, however, among the Paris Fathers caused some delay in their proceedings, and soon it was too late for any private arrangement.

Inasmuch as the misfortune which had befallen Père de Lavalette was due to an act of war on the part of an enemy



whose quarrel was not with him but with his country, the Jesuits might have looked for sympathy, and even assistance from their rulers. Unfortunately these were the very men who were plotting their ruin, and were welcoming their present embarrassment as a means which might be utilized for that end. Indeed it is said to have been at the secret instances of their foes at the Court or in the Parlement that the two firms, who would have profited more in the long run by trusting to the spontaneous efforts of the Fathers, proceeded to take action in the Consular (that is, the Commercial) Courts, the firm of Lionçy and Gouffre in that of Marseilles, the firm of Grou in that of Paris. They claimed that, the Society being a single organized body, the various officers of which were appointed to their respective posts by its superiors, Provincial and General, the entire body in all its parts should be held pecuniarily responsible for the debts of any one of its members or establishments; and they asked for the power, in the event of non-payment, to distrain on the goods of the Society wherever they might find them in the kingdom. Such a ground of claim was absurd, for on the same principle a Bishop should be held responsible for the debts of all his clergy, and the Pope for those of every Bishop and priest under his jurisdiction. None the less it was accepted readily by the Courts, which decided in favour of the claimants, in the Grou case on January 30th, 1760, for the sum of thirty thousand *livres*,<sup>1</sup> in the Lionçy case on May 29th, 1760, for the much larger sum of a million and a half *livres*. In each instance the leave to distrain was also granted in the event of non-payment.

The Fathers seem at first to have accepted the difficult situation resignedly, and to have busied themselves with the endeavour to collect the money; but, presumably because the creditors showed themselves too exacting in the matter, of time, they sought after some months the advice of eminent *avocats*, and being assured by these that the consular judgments of the preceding year were manifestly unsound in law, determined to appeal to the Grand Chamber of the Parlement of Paris. For this again they have been blamed even by friendly critics, as for a foolish step, the fierce bias against them of this Parlement being so well known. But at least they showed confidence in the justice of their cause as well as their desire to take every

<sup>1</sup> *Recueil par ordre de dates, de tous les Arrêts de Parlement . . . concernant les ci-devant soi-disant Jésuites*, vol. i.



lawful means not only for their self-preservation, but also to avert disaster from the many good works with which they were entrusted. The decision of the Parlement was given on May 8th, 1761, on the basis of the Report of M. Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau, a rigid Jansenist.<sup>1</sup> It was, of course, in confirmation of the judgment of the Consular Court, and was based on the same inadequate ground that has been mentioned above. The condemned Fathers were given a year to take up the still outstanding bills of Père de Lavalette, as well as to pay off the interest that had accumulated during the interval, and the expenses of the various prosecutions, both that before the Parlement and any others in which the firm of Lionçy might have become involved with their own creditors. If by the end of the year these claims had not been fully satisfied, the restraint might be levied on their goods within the kingdom.<sup>2</sup>

Three things are worthy of notice about this Report of M. Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau and the *arrêt* in which it was adopted. First, it expressly acknowledges that a large portion of the debts due to Lionçy and Gouffre had been already paid off, which fact should be coupled with the further fact that all the debts to Grou and Son must have been paid off, since no further action was brought by that firm. This is evidence that the Fathers did not make their appeal in disregard for the sufferings of their creditors. Secondly, that by this time it had been realized by the courts that others besides the Jesuits had proprietary claims upon their colleges, for the *arrêt* expressly stipulates that the rights of these others shall be respected by the distrainers. Later on it became known that, when these other liens on the Colleges had been deducted, the remainder was quite insufficient to meet the claims of the creditors. Thirdly, that M. Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau, instead of confining himself to the question of the Society's liabilities for the debts of one of its houses, dilated much on the iniquities of the Jesuit Institute, and the corrupt doctrines and practices of its members, insisting chiefly on their propensity to regicide. This irrelevance, if improper in an *avocat*, was not undesigned. It has already been suggested that the firm of Lionçy, in taking

<sup>1</sup> A man is not necessarily responsible for the sins of his sons, but it is of interest to know that the son of this M. Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau became a fanatical revolutionist, and was very prominent among those who voted for the execution of Louis XVI.

<sup>2</sup> *Recueil par ordre de dates.*

action against the whole Society, may have been influenced not so much by their own judgment as by the intimations received from persons highly placed, who had their own objects to gain by the manœuvre. It is at least certain that the attack on the Society was planned beforehand, and the various stages in the programme so arranged that each would seem to provoke the one succeeding it, and so lead on to the final catastrophe. On this point it may be well to quote the testimony of a contemporary writer who, though anonymous, is described by M. St. Victor, and with evident truth, as a "man well acquainted with the intrigues of the time."<sup>1</sup>

Whilst the supporters of the party were working thus ardently (by inundating the country with anti-Jesuit pamphlets) to create a prejudice in the public mind, the magistrates were concerting together in secret the blows they proposed to strike with the hand of authority. Several times a week meetings were held at the house of President Gauthier de Brétigny. MM. Clément, Lambert, Chauvelin, Bèze de Lys, Rolland, Laverdy, and some others, directed all the operations. In all the towns they had their emissaries, charged to send in reports against the Jesuits, and everywhere to spy into their conduct . . . every one saw that the storm was gathering.

It was clearly then by pre-arrangement that M. Lepelletier de Saint-Fargeau went out of his way to comment adversely on the methods of the Society. He was preparing the way for the next stage, in which the existence of the Society was to be directly attacked.

This next stage was initiated on April 17, 1761,<sup>2</sup> by the Abbé Chauvelin, who made a speech before the Grand Chamber in which he took note that the Jesuits were appealing to their Constitutions as establishing the financial independence of their several houses. This, he contended, was the first occasion in which the Constitutions of the Society had been brought within the cognizance of the Parlement, a circumstance which, he suggested, should force upon the court certain conclusions. If the Constitutions had never yet been officially examined by the State authorities, how could it be said that the Society possessed State recognition in the country, and yet if it had not

<sup>1</sup> *Destruction des Jésuites en France*, Anecdote politique et intéressant trouvée dans les papiers d'un homme bien instruit des intrigues du temps. Publiée à Londres en 1766. Reprinted in M. St. Victor's *Documents concernant la Compagnie de Jésus*. Tome Ier. 1827.

<sup>2</sup> *Recueil par ordre de dates*.

that, was its existence more than tolerated, and such as could be terminated whenever it might seem desirable? Then again, why had the Constitutions never been laid by the Society before the State authorities? Was it not because the Society had always made a point of shrouding them in mystery, one of its rules expressly enjoining that they should be kept secret; and if they needed to be thus shrouded in mystery, must not the reason be that they contained provisions which would shock public opinion? Having raised this suspicion the Abbé Chauvelin next showed that at all events he personally had seen these mysterious Constitutions, for he ventured to quote (and misinterpret) many passages from them, from which he deduced that they "contained several things contrary to good order, to ecclesiastical discipline, and the maxims of the kingdom." Hence, he recommended that the Parlement should now examine them, and take such measures as the result might show to be requisite.

Impressed by these considerations the court adopted the course recommended, and began that day by ordering the Jesuit Superiors in Paris to send in a copy of the most recent edition of their Constitutions—that published at Prague in 1757—within three days. If it imagined that the demand would be unpalatable to the Jesuits, it must have been surprised to find Père de Montigny the very next morning at its bar, with the required copy in his hands. There was no reason, however, why the Jesuits should hesitate. It is true, their Constitutions had from the first contained a clause forbidding them to be shown to persons external to the Society—that is, without the Superior's leave. It was a clause which had been customary in the Constitutions of religious orders, and was motived by the feeling that the principles of religious perfection might seem foolishness to the man of the world, and excite his mockery. But there was never any attempt or desire to conceal them from well-disposed persons, still less from the authorities of Church or State, and as a matter of fact, quite contrary to what Chauvelin had represented, they had more than once been submitted to the French Sovereigns and their Parlements. Thus it is proved from the text itself of various Edicts and *Arrêts*, by the author of *Nouvelles Observations sur les Jugemens rendus contre les Jésuites*,<sup>1</sup> that the Jesuit Constitutions were before the Parlement on January 20th, 1560, at the Council

<sup>1</sup> Published at Bordeaux in 1763.

of Poissy in 1561, before Charles IX. in July, 1565, and Henry III. in May, 1580, again before the Parlement on December 23rd, 1592,<sup>1</sup> before Henri IV. in 1603, before Parlement in 1692 and again in 1765. Moreover, if the Society had wished to keep its Constitutions secret, it would not have allowed them to be published in several editions, or to be placed on sale, with the result, as was the case at that time, that almost every well-furnished library in France contained a copy.

Chauvelin must have known all this, and so must many other members of the Grand Chamber, but the object was to obtain a pretext for destroying the Society, and accordingly the copy of the Constitutions was handed over to the *Gens du Roi* to examine.

They were to report to the Parlement the results of their examination on June 2nd, but meanwhile the King had been moved by the representations of his family, and bethought himself of making some feeble opposition to a work of destruction the injustice of which he perfectly realized. Accordingly he sent word to the Parlement on May 30th,<sup>2</sup> that

He wished to undertake himself the examination of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesuits, and bade them send to him on the Sunday now following (that is, the very next day) the First President with two presidents, and the *Gens du Roi*, who were to bring with them the copy of the said Constitutions deposited by the Jesuits at their bar.

This Royal order was complied with, but another copy of the Constitutions was procured by the Parlement and handed over to the *Gens du Roi*, who were also granted an extension of time for their examination of the same. They came before the assembled Chamber of the Parlement on July 3, 4, 6, and 7, 1761,<sup>3</sup> when a voluminous *compte-rendu* on the Constitutions of the Society was read by M. Omer Joly de Fleury, who, as the *Avocat-Generai*, was their spokesman. It gave an analysis of the two volumes of the Institute, so far as the character of the Constitutions were in view, and argued on the same lines as M. Chauvelin, but at much greater length. The nature of the improprieties it professed to find in the Institute can be gathered from the conclusions in which it terminates. It

<sup>1</sup> "Vu les dites Institutions et Constitutions d'icelle Société, approuvées par les Souverains Pontifes, et nommement par le feu Pape Grégoire XIII.," says the *arrêt* of Dec. 23, 1592.

<sup>2</sup> *Recueil.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

recommends certain alterations the chief of which are that exemptions shall be done away with ; that no member who has taken simple vows shall be sent away by the General except for canonical faults ; that the General shall have no control over the finances of the local houses which shall be administered by the communities themselves assembled in Chapter ; that the superiors and other officers, both Provincial and Local, shall be elected by the triennial Provincial Congregations, and that these triennial gatherings shall be presided over by Royal Commissioners. It is suggested that the King, having caused Constitutions of this kind to be examined and proved by his Parlement, should issue Letters Patents authorizing them in the Kingdom. It must be granted that this *compte-rendu*, though it absurdly misconstrues the sense of the Constitutions, is far milder in its tone and character than M. Chauvelin's denunciation. It also differs markedly from the latter in its abstention from those suggestions of intrigue on the part of the Jesuits in which M. Chauvelin had been so lavish. It even acknowledges that, while condemning their Constitutions, it has no fault to find with the conduct of the Jesuits themselves.

There is [it says], properly speaking, no question of reform here ; and we may apply to the Jesuits what (on a former occasion) M. Talon said of other Congregations who gave such edification to the public by their manner of living, that they had no need (in this sense) of reformation.

Such a testimony coming from such a source is extremely valuable and we shall have occasion later on to point out its full significance.

The Parlement having heard this *compte-rendu* of the *Gens du Roi* next ordered it to be referred to Commissioners on the basis of whose Report it would deliberate and act. The Commissioners appointed were the Abbé de Terray, M. de l'Averdy, and apparently two others.

On the day following, July 8,<sup>1</sup> M. Chauvelin came forward again, this time to denounce the teaching of the Society on faith and morals. His discourse is a monument of malign industry, for it teems with references and quotations, none of which will bear examination, but which, by being massed together in a number which defies refutation, succeed in conveying the impression that the Jesuit writers, even those among

<sup>1</sup> *Recueil*.

them who enjoy the highest credit among Catholic theologians, are monsters of iniquity in their teaching. As the question will recur presently it need only be said here that quite a half of this invective is concerned with the doctrine of tyrannicide, which it represents the Society as having consistently taught and practised—endeavouring on the flimsiest evidence, and in the teeth of established facts, to fix on them responsibility for all the successful and unsuccessful attempts to assassinate the Kings of France, from that of Jacob Clement downwards. M. Chauvelin's second denunciation, like his first, was referred in the first instance to the *Gens du Roi* who reported on July 18th, and in the second to the same commissioners as had been told off to report on the Constitutions, chief among whom, it will be borne in mind, was the Abbé de Terray. May we not gauge the sincerity of the scandal which these good Parlementaires professed to take at the moral teaching of the Jesuits, when we find them entrusting the office of reporting on it to such a man?

To go back for a moment to the *compte-rendu* on the Constitutions of M. Omer Joly de Fleury, a large portion of its contents is occupied with the endeavour to show that though the Society had been authorized in France by Henri IV.'s Edict of 1604 and supplemented by numerous Letters Patent since issued on behalf of its different Foundations, the right of legal existence thus obtained had been throughout conditioned by certain qualifications, and by the non-observance of these had been forfeited. The *Avocat-Général* had an important reason for taking up this position. It was beyond doubt that the Parlement could not of its own authority set aside Royal Edicts and Letters Patent, and yet it was felt that if they were to succeed in proscribing and destroying the Society they must rely mainly on the authority of their own *arrêts*, and hope from the King only that he would not intervene to stop them.

It did not, however, escape the notice of Louis XV. that by pursuing this policy they were trenching on the rights of his crown, and accordingly he sent them another communication on August 2nd,<sup>1</sup> ordering that the Jesuits within the space of six months should send in to the Conseil du Roi a full list of the Edicts, Letters Patent, and other title-deeds of their houses and residences, and requiring of the Parlement that it should surcease from all further decrees concerning the Society, so as

<sup>1</sup> *Recueil.*

to leave time for the Royal inquiry to be completed. Had Louis XIV. been still on the throne the Parlement would not have ventured to disobey so imperative an order. But, knowing the weakness of Louis XV. and the support they could count on from his mistress and his ministers, they felt they could palm off on him a purely formal compliance with his orders, and continue their campaign unaltered save for a few adjustments more nominal than real. Thus they returned answer to the King that they had registered his orders and would refrain for a year's space from *arrêts* of a definitive or provisional character, save only such as

their oath to the Court, their fidelity and affection for the sacred person of the said Lord King, and their devotedness to the cause of public peace, could not permit them to put off decreeing, should the exigency of cause arising impel them.<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, they ordered—claiming this as their traditional right—that the list of title-deeds, and along with it full statistics of the names, ages, offices, property, &c., of all their members, should be sent by the Jesuits, not direct to the Conseil, but to the Parlement, which would pass it on to the King.

Seeing that the Parlement, in full accordance with its Reporters, professed to be taking action against the Society as constituting a serious danger to the State, it was perhaps not so wonderful that they should have deemed "the exigency of the cases" to have required their prompt attention, even as soon as four days later. Accordingly, on August 6th, after listening to a demand of the Procureur-General, and hearing the Abbé de Terray's report on the same, they entertained an appeal *comme d'abus* against the various Papal Bulls by which the Society had been approved in the first instance, and afterwards confirmed and enriched with spiritual privileges. Certain arrangements prescribed or grants made to the Society in these Bulls are indicated, and alleged to be abuses not tolerable in the kingdom. These abuses coincide with those represented by M. Omer Joly de Fleury, and bear on the power of the General, the exaction of blind obedience, the non-reciprocity of the simple vows, the extent of the privileges; and are declared to render the Jesuit Institute "menacing to the authority of the Church, of the General and Particular Councils, of the Holy

<sup>1</sup> *Recueil.*



See and all Ecclesiastical Superiors, as well as to that of Sovereigns." Bold language this for a Parlement which, if it had a distinguishing mark in the whole course of its history, had it precisely in the persistent opposition it was wont to offer to Pope and King, Bishops, and Councils; bold language particularly for the Parlement of that generation, which had been so recently engaged in a campaign against the clergy for obeying the Holy See and their Bishops in a matter exclusively spiritual, and by so doing had provoked their King to send them into banishment. Later on we shall see how far the Pope and the clergy took the same or a different view of this supposed menace to their existence; and, meanwhile, we may note two things about this Appeal *comme d'abus*, first, that although held to be so urgent, it alleged no "abuse" in the Society which had not been in it, and been perfectly well known to all classes of the nation, throughout the hundred and fifty years and more of its existence in France; and, secondly, that it imputed no misconduct whatever to individuals, or anything inconsistent with M. Omer Joly de Fleury's admission, that "they had given such edification to the public as to stand in no need of reformation."

On the same 6th of August, the Court of Parlement issued another *arrêt* still more serious in its character, and professing to be called for by the character of the Society's teaching. The Abbé de Terray, to whom M. Chauvelin's denunciation of this teaching, along with the report thereon of the *Gens du Roi*, had been referred for further verification, had within the short intervening space of nineteen days completed his gigantic task and recommended for condemnation, on the ground of their lax doctrine, thirty-three works of Jesuit theologians, among them being writers of high reputation, like Bellarmine, Salmeron, Vasquez, Suarez, Lessius, and Toletus. Accordingly, the Parlement, all the Chambers being assembled,

having [read] the conclusions of the Procureur-Général, and heard the Report of Maître Joseph-Marie Terray, *conseiller*, all having been considered, ordered twenty-three out of the condemned list [Suarez, it must be allowed, not being among them], to be torn and burnt in the court of the Palace, at the foot of the grand staircase, by the executioner of High Justice, as seditious, destructive of every principle of Christian morality, teaching a murderous and abominable doctrine, opposed not merely to the safety of the lives of the citizens, but even to that of the sacred persons of Sovereigns.



Nor did it stop here. The definitive settlement of the consequences which ought to ensue on the discovery of this evil teaching was to be conjoined with the definitive settlement of the appeal *comme d'abus*, and therefore left to stand over for a while, but it would be too dangerous to allow the King's youthful subjects to be exposed for a day longer than was necessary to the evil influences of masters impregnated with these doctrines, and so it was ordered, under severe penalties, that, until the final settlement was pronounced, no more novices should be received or scholastics admitted to take their vows; also that all Jesuits should cease to hold schools, and all pupils should cease to attend Jesuit schools, after October 1st in any town where other schools existed, and after April 1st in towns where no other school existed—in which latter towns the local authorities were enjoined to see that by April 1st other schools were provided.

Among other consequences flowing from this drastic measure was the ruin of Père de Lavalette's creditors, who thus lost all chance of having their claims satisfied. The main source, as has been explained, from which the Jesuits had been trying to pay them, were the savings out of the funds they were entitled to take from their College endowments on the score of suitable maintenance, and this must now cease with the cessation of their educational labours. And, although a show of consideration for these creditors was kept up for some time longer, and on April 23, 1762, the houses of the Jesuits were put in charge of what we should now-a-days call an Official Receiver, the Courts had lost interest in persons who had ceased to be useful to them, and it eventually left them to their fate.

The *arrêts* of August 6th were duly communicated to the King, who, however, responded on August 29th, by Letters Patent, announcing that his own Royal Commissioners had now reported on the Jesuit Constitutions, and he felt that the matter required of him a serious deliberation. In order, therefore, that his deliberation might not be embarrassed, he bade the Parlement suspend the execution of their *arrêts* for a whole year. They received these intimations of the Royal will in their usual way. They registered the Letters Patent, but with the stipulation that the surcease should expire in less than a year, namely on April 1, 1762; and while they consented out of deference to the King's wishes to leave the Jesuit professors

in possession of their schools, they held to their *veto* against receiving new novices, or advancing those already received to their vows. Finally they remonstrated with the King for putting obstacles in the path of a course of action which they assured him was imperatively required "for the safety of the persons of Sovereigns, the tranquillity of States, the principles of morals, the education of youth, the welfare and honour of religion."

Louis XV. does not seem to have resented at the time this abatement of his full orders, but on March 26, 1762, he sent them an Edict based on the results of his deliberations. It authorized the continued existence of the Society, but subjected its members to the laws of the Kingdom, to the authority of the King, and the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, regulated the manner in which the General should exercise his authority in France, and on the other hand cancelled all that had been decreed against them by the Parlement since August 1, 1761. An Edict thus innovating on the terms of their Constitutions was not acceptable to the Jesuits, but neither was it acceptable to the Parlement, which this time flatly refused to register it. They declared in a dignified way that they could not register the Edict, nor did they think it necessary to offer a reason for their refusal, as the King himself would feel that such an Edict was undesirable, if he would be good enough to read the document they were venturing respectfully to send him.

The accompanying document which had been sent also to every Bishop and magistrate throughout the Kingdom, was the famous *Extraits des Assertions*, a quarto volume, purporting to contain extracts from Jesuit writers, illustrative of their pernicious and dangerous moral teaching. It was put forth as a fuller demonstration, by exact citation of the passages, of the charges against Jesuit teaching, which the Abbé Chauvelin had stated more compendiously in his *compte-rendu* of July 8th, 1761. It was drawn up by the command of the Parlement, and its authors are supposed to have been M. Roussel de la Tour, of whom we can find nothing save that he was a *Conseiller du Parlement*; the Abbé Goujet, a learned but violent Jansenist writer, who had been prominent among the Appellants, and supposed himself to have been cured of stone by the intercession of the Deacon Paris; the Abbé Minard, who for his Jansenist opinions, had been suspended by Archbishop de Beaumont, who in later years became a Constitutionalist priest, and

who when the Terror was over, agitated for the perpetuation of that schism by the consecration of a successor to Bishop Gobel; and, lastly but chiefly, as being the presiding spirit of the work, Dom C. Clemençy, of the Congregation of St. Maur. It is sad, if it be true, that a writer of such merit as the author of the *Art de vérifier les dates*, should have had part in so discreditable a compilation; but, like the other two ecclesiastics, he was noted for his pro-Jansenist bias, being one of the biographers of Port-Royal, and the author of some spiteful and utterly unfounded anti-Jesuit tracts.<sup>1</sup>

These *Extraits des Assertions* are not likely to have moved Louis XV., but his fits of activity were soon spent, and the Parlement was again left to continue its work of destruction. When April 1st came, the Jesuits were turned out of their eighty-four Colleges within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, and the great educational crisis commenced which had no small share in de-Christianizing France and preparing the Revolution. For it was impossible at such short notice to supply the place of the ejected teachers in these eighty-four Colleges, and we can realize the straits to which the authorities were put when we find that some of the leading Philosophers were asked to name some fit persons for the office. We can imagine what kind of teachers such men would deem fit.

On August 6th, 1762, that is, exactly a year from the lodgment of the appeal *comme d'abus*, it was heard and judged. The judgment—which, in the estimation of its authors, was intended to be the final suppression of the Society of Jesus in the French dominions—runs in the King's name, but that is only a formality. It was not signed by the King, nor did it in any sense emanate from him, but from his Court of Parlement whose *arrêt* he is made to recite. The *arrêt* is an enormous document which begins by enumerating a vast mass of historical and other documents, steps taken by Kings and Parlements, by Popes and Bishops, by Universities and others, in the whole course of the two hundred years of the Society's existence, all tending to discredit it; but among them an entire absence of the vastly larger mass which could have been enumerated, of utterances and actions by all these personages and classes in its favour. Also, though so voluminous and issued in the name of an eminent judicial body, it is quite unscientific and wholly partizan in its character, as an intelligent reader cannot fail to

<sup>1</sup> See the notice of him in the *Dictionnaire Biographie Universelle*.

perceive even after a short inspection. Two points may be selected as illustrating the truth of this. First, in one place Benedict XIV. is cited as having on December 20th, 1741, "forbidden the *soi-disant* Jesuits to venture any more in the future to reduce the said Indians to slavery, to sell them, &c." This quotation is inserted, of course, to suggest that among their other crimes the Jesuits had been notable as cruel slave-masters. It will hardly be credited, but can be seen at once on reference to the Bull, that the prohibition is addressed *universis et singulis personis*, "to each and every person, of whatever state, sex, grade, condition, dignity, &c.," and that the mention of the Jesuits occurs in the midst of an enumeration of the various religious orders, where it stands merely for completeness' sake. Moreover, as a matter of fact the attitude of the Jesuit missionaries to the Bull was that they had solicited it as a protection for their converts against the surrounding Europeans. Secondly, the *arrêt* incorporates and makes important use of a so-called Edict of Henri IV. against the Society, dated 1595, of which till then no one had ever heard, of which the supposititious character is demonstrated by every possible species of argument,<sup>1</sup> and as evidence for which they can only cite an "expedition (that is, a "copy,") deposited at the bar of our Court and (copies?) of the *arrêts d'enregistrement* of the said Edict at the Courts of Parlement of Rouen and Dijon." They should have been able to cite better evidence than this, and when one reads at the head of this judgment of 1762 the compromising words, "Having heard the Report of Maitre Joseph-Marie Terray, Conseiller," one can but reflect how very likely a person he was to perpetrate a fraud of this description.

Still, the decision of the court was in favour of the Appeal. The abuses detailed in it as inherent in the Society's Institute were declared to be established, and together with these the pernicious character of its teaching; the vows of the Jesuits were declared null and void from the commencement, as having been taken in an Order so stained with abuses: the members were bidden to vacate the colleges, to lay aside the Society's dress, and cease to hold communications with its *ci-devant* superiors: none of them were permitted to continue to teach in any college whatever, or obtain degrees in any University, or have charge of souls, &c., unless they had first taken an oath promising to

<sup>1</sup> See "L'Edit de Henri VI." in *Les Documents concernant la Compagnie de Jésus*, Vol. i.

hold and profess "the Liberties of the Gallican Church," the Four Articles of the Declaration of 1682, the canons and maxims received in the Kingdom; promising also not to have communications with the General or superiors of the Society or any of its foreign members, to combat the pernicious doctrines contained in the *Extraits des Assertions*, and to renounce all subjection to the Institute and Constitutions of the Society.

The Parlement of Paris thus took the lead in this work of destruction, and the provincial Parlements were expected to co-operate. With four exceptions, those of Alsace, Franche-Comté, Flanders, and Lorraine, all did as they were ordered. In three instances the *comptes-rendus* of the *Avocats-Généraux* to these Provincial Parlements have been preserved, and that of M. Caradeuc de la Chalotais, the *Avocat-Général* at Rennes, is remarkable for its unfairness, is, it must be admitted, remarkable also for its literary distinction, in which it contrasts greatly with the heavy and wearisome *comptes-rendus* sent in at Paris. It is on this account that it has come to be the most widely read of them all, and to be taken as the standard statement of the case against the Jesuits in France. As regards its character, it must be remarked that M. Caradeuc de la Chalotais was more in league with the Philosophers than with the Jansenists, and that the traces of this affinity may be seen in the more general character of his denunciation. All kinds of monks, he decides, are bad for the country, and there is not much to choose among them, but as the Jesuits are the most powerful, let them be removed first. We may thank, however, this writer for one passage in his *compte-rendu*, that in which he distinguishes between the Society and its individual members.

I declare [he says] that so far from accusing the entire Order of Jesuits, that is, all the members, of fanaticism, I exonerate almost all, and especially the French Jesuits. . . . I would exonerate them as willingly, were it possible, as regards principles of morality which in truth they have only adopted, and which they seem to disavow by their regular conduct.<sup>1</sup>

Nor must it be overlooked that in the voting of these Provincial Parlements there was nowhere anything like the unanimity which marked the action of the Parlement of Paris. Thus (for the figures have been preserved) at Rennes 32 were for the suppression, 29 against; at Rouen 20 were for, 13 against; at Toulouse 41 were for, 39 against; at Perpignan 5 were for,

<sup>1</sup> *Compte-rendu des Constitutions des Jésuites*, 1762, pp. 75, 76. Edition of 1762.

4 against ; at Bordeaux 23 were for, 18 against ; at Aix 24 were for, 22 against. Nor was it wonderful there should be these imposing minorities, if, as at Aix, the Parlement was expected by the majority to assume the truth of the quotations made by the Parlement of Paris.

Although Louis XV., practised upon as he was by La Pompadour, Choiseul, and Berryer, proved himself too feeble to offer effectual resistance to his Parlements in their campaign of destruction, and to carry out the alternative conclusions which his own better judgment recommended, the few steps he did take to transfer the investigation to his own tribunal had the result of eliciting numerous protests from the Bishops and clergy ; and these, especially when conjoined with the Letters of Clement XIII., offer a mass of most respectable testimony to the calumnious character of the charges contained in the *comptes-rendus*. In the next article of this series we shall avail ourselves of the powerful argument thence derivable, and we may terminate the present article by calling attention to a few salient features in the foregoing narrative and referring them to the judgment of any candid reader.

1. The charges which the Parlement professed to have found established, and to which they appealed as demanding so remorseless and far-reaching a punishment of some thousands of people, are those contained in the various *comptes-rendus*, or rather in those of the Abbé Chauvelin and M. Omer Joly de Fleury—for the rest, including those of MM. Chalotais and Ripert de Monclar, were based on these, and professed to add little or nothing on the authority of independent investigation.

2. These *comptes-rendus* bring charges which fall into two categories, one condemning what they allege to have found in the Jesuit Constitutions, the other what they allege to have found in the Jesuit writers on Dogma and Moral Theology. In other words, no charges are brought against the personal conduct of the Jesuits. Chauvelin indeed brings a number of general charges of intriguing, of cruelty, of idolatry, &c., but all on the basis of inference from their alleged rules and teaching, none on the basis of any direct testimony he can invoke ; whilst M. Omer Joly de Fleury and M. Chalotais unite in using language about the Jesuits as individuals which are only intelligible on the supposition that nothing was seen in them as they then were, to correspond with the horrible vices

which their Constitutions and writings were declared calculated to engender. And here it is very noticeable that the denouncers of the Society in France took an exactly opposite line to their denouncers in Portugal. In Portugal their Constitutions were pronounced by Pombal<sup>1</sup> to be good and holy, the misfortune being that the Jesuits themselves did not observe them in letter or spirit; in France the Constitutions were pronounced pernicious in their character and tendency, but the Jesuits themselves men of blameless lives. On which contrast we believe it was Voltaire who remarked that the whole matter seemed capable of a simple solution. Let the French Jesuits be sent to Portugal to keep their Rule, and the Portuguese Jesuits be sent to France to break their Rule.

3. If the offensive features in the Society were alleged to be in its Constitutions, the answer which at once suggests itself is two-fold—first, that if it be really so, not the Jesuits but the Holy See, indeed the Universal Church, was responsible, for these Rules were not private but public documents, and had received the approval of nineteen Popes, a vast number of Bishops, and many Sovereigns; secondly, that it could not be really so, or else the members would infallibly become, what according even to this hostile testimony they were not.

4. A similar argument applies to the allegations concerning the teaching of the Society. Men who could in their writings inculcate the scandalous opinions of the *Extraits des Assertions*, must reflect those opinions in their lives, and the lives of those who came under their influence, whereas as we have seen, it was practically, by the failure to invoke any direct testimony, and even formally acknowledged, that neither the Jesuits nor their friends and pupils were of such a character. Perhaps, therefore, it may seem more reasonable for those who cannot study for themselves the Jesuit works from which these extracts profess to be taken, to conclude that they are extracts unfairly made—all the more so when they find even a writer like Dollinger saying that,

the entire fabrication was such a downright fraud, that one did not know whether to marvel most at the audacity or the dishonesty of these men. In some places the Latin text was falsified, in others the French translations garbled; and by means of interpolations and omissions, changes of words or of punctuation, the writers of the Society were

<sup>1</sup> See Pombal's letter to d'Almada, the Portuguese representative at the Vatican, ap. Père de Ravignan's *Clément XIII. et Clément XIV.* p. 97.



made to say things of which they had never thought, indeed were frequently made to uphold the very opinions which they were rejecting or refuting.<sup>1</sup>

Theiner, too, another writer whose bias was far from friendly to the Society, speaks of this work in similar terms of condemnation:<sup>2</sup>

All France was flooded with malicious lampoons against the Society, of which the notorious *Extraits des Assertions* surpassed all the rest. . . . In this work malice and untruthfulness vied together in a common emulation which should outbid the other. There was no iniquity which the Jesuits were not made to teach, or of which they were not accused; never was bad faith carried to more outrageous lengths. This book, a veritable cesspool of lies, was sent by an *arrêt* of Parlement of March 5, 1762, to all the Bishops and magistrates of the kingdom—a detestable device for ascertaining who were friends and who foes of the Jesuits, and for joining all together in a common crusade against the Order. This object was fully attained.

5. Lastly, we may leave it for the reader to consider whether in a matter in which so much depends on the care taken by the compiler to see that his extracts are not only verbally correct, but convey, even when apart from their context, the true meaning of the author, especially to persons unfamiliar with the circumstances in which these moral problems arise—in other words, whether in a matter where an ordinary reader has to depend so much on the honesty and competence of the compiler—implicit credit can be given to such authorities as Chauvelin, de Terray, Clément, Goujet, and Minard.

S. F. S.

<sup>1</sup> Dollinger, *Fortsetzung der Handbuchs der Christlichen Kirchengeschichte von Hortig*. II. Bd. 2 Abth. p. 794. We take this quotation from Father Duhr's, S.J., valuable *Jesuiten-Fabeln*, p. 437. ("Die verruchte Jesuiten Moral.")

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire du Pontificat de Clément XIV.* I. i. § 15.



## *Dickens and his Models.*

---

READERS of Charles Dickens' *Bleak House* will not have easily forgotten Mrs. Jellyby, the philanthropist, who neglects her husband and family, and devotes all her time and energies to West Africa and the regeneration of the natives of Borrioboola-Gha.

It is not, however, generally known, that in this instance, as in many others, Dickens was painting his character from life, and that the lady who unwittingly sat to him for the portrait of Mrs. Jellyby was Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, the "Emigrant's Friend," who was born at Wootton, near Northampton, and who, after her life of labour, lies in the cemetery of the same town in an almost unknown grave.

If we were to judge her life and character by the caricature that Dickens has drawn for us, we should have a very different notion of the true work that this heroine of charity accomplished, and it is hardly to the credit of the novelist, that for the sake of scoring a literary success, he should have given us such a travesty of the real woman as he has undoubtedly done in Mrs. Jellyby.

A slight sketch of her career will show us a life of admirable self-sacrifice. From her earliest years she began to devote herself to the needy and distressed, and her labours ceased only with her life. She was born in May, 1808, the daughter of William Jones, a small farmer, and married in 1830, a Captain Chisholm, of the East India service, who nobly aided his wife in her charitable work. Two years after their marriage they sailed for India and settled at Madras. There, horrified, we are told, at the vices of the place, she established schools for the young girls and orphans of the soldiers, which developed into an establishment called the Female School of Industry. In 1838, Captain Chisholm and his family left India and settled finally in Sydney, the capital of New South Wales. In January, 1841, Mrs. Chisholm, struck by the helplessness of female

emigrants on their arrival in the Colony, opened a house for the reception of newly-arrived colonists, where they could be taken care of till situations could be found for them. Her energy knew no limits; she herself frequently went into the interior in charge of parties of women and saw them properly established. At first she bore her own expenses, but as her work became known she received contributions from many sources, which enabled her to extend her operations. In February, 1846, the Colonization Society, on her departure for England, presented her with an address and a purse of one hundred and fifty guineas. In London she continued to aid persons desirous of emigrating. She communicated with the friends of settlers and personally superintended the shipment of the inexperienced. In April, 1847, she gave evidence in the House of Lords, before the Committee on the Execution of the Criminal Laws.<sup>1</sup> She persuaded the Government to send out a number of pauper children to their parents—liberated convicts, and she herself helped the wives of many liberated convicts to emigrate. She next established a Family Colonization Loan Society, to enable people of slender means to pay by small instalments the amount of their passage. In 1850, she published a pamphlet, entitled the *A B C of Colonization*, in which she denounced the existing plans of emigration, and followed this up by another work, named *Emigration and Transportation considered*, which was addressed to Lord Grey. In April, 1854, she returned to Australia and successfully carried on her work there during a further period of twelve years, returning again to England in 1866.

A civil list pension of £100 was granted to her on June 19th, 1867. She died on March 25th, 1877, and was buried on the 31st in Northampton cemetery, with the rites of the Catholic Church, to which she became a convert in early womanhood.

Such a life as we have depicted will show us how widely Dickens departed from the literal truth when he drew Mrs. Jellyby. Doubtless, it may be urged that an author is not bound to strict accuracy, but is allowed a certain latitude in his delineation of character. But we have a more serious indictment to bring against Dickens. Just before the time when he was about to begin writing *Bleak House*, he was brought into communication with Mrs. Chisholm. He had

<sup>1</sup> *Report of First Committee, 1847*, pp. 385—389.

heard, it seems, of her work through mutual friends; he took an interest in it and even expressed a wish to be of service to the cause Mrs. Chisholm had at heart, by giving her emigrants' letters publicity in his forthcoming book.

The following letter from Lady Herbert of Lea, to Mrs. Chisholm on the subject, will fully bear out the above statement.

5, Carlton Gardens,  
Sunday, Feb. 24th, 1850.

Dear Mrs. Chisholm,

I saw Mr. Dickens to-day and he has commissioned me to say that if you will allow him, and unless he hears to the contrary from you, he will call upon you at 2 o'clock on *Tuesday next*, the 26th.

I told him about your emigrants' letters, and he seemed to think that the giving them publicity would be an important engine towards helping on our work, and he has so completely the confidence of the lower classes (who all read his Books if they can read at all), that I think if you can persuade him to bring them out in his new work it will be an immense step gained.

He is so singularly clever and agreeable that I hope you will forgive me for having made this appointment without your direct sanction, and for having also told him that I knew you wished to make his acquaintance.

Believe me, dear Madam,  
Very sincerely yours,  
ELIZABETH HERBERT.

It is to be presumed that the meeting took place and that Dickens made Mrs. Chisholm's acquaintance, and that he learned something besides of the work she was doing among the emigrants. If, however, she had looked for any good results from the book he was next engaged in (*Bleak House*) by his giving publicity in it to her self-denying labours, she was doomed to be most egregiously disappointed. Mrs. Chisholm had furthermore the right to feel indignant, especially after her hopes had been thus raised, at the manner in which her whole scheme of work was treated with the most scathing ridicule. True, instead of Australia, the scene was laid in a neighbouring continent, but no doubt can remain in any reasonable mind as to who was intended to be represented. Let Mrs. Jellyby speak for herself.

The African project at present employs my whole time. It involves me in correspondence with public bodies, and with private individuals anxious for the welfare of their species all over the cuntry. I am

happy to say it is advancing. We hope by this time next year to have from a hundred and fifty to two hundred healthy families cultivating coffee and educating the natives of Borrioboola-Gha, on the left bank of the Niger.

The sketch of Mrs. Jellyby is not indeed unflattering :

She was a pretty, very diminutive, plump woman of from forty to fifty (Mrs. Chisholm's age), with handsome eyes, though they had a curious habit of seeming to look a long way off, as if they could see nothing nearer than Africa.

But it is in the description of the neglected household, with its lack of all domestic comfort, her forlorn, unkempt children, her suppressed husband (whom no one imagined to be Mr. Jellyby), that Dickens has indulged his full flow of sarcastic humour. Read the following account of the dinner :

When we went downstairs we found a mug, with a "Present from Tunbridge Wells" on it, lighted up on the staircase window, with a floating wick ; and a young woman, with a swelled face bound up in a flannel bandage, blowing the fire of the drawing-room and choaking dreadfully. It smoked to that degree in short, that we all sat coughing and crying with the windows open for half an hour ; during which Mrs. Jellyby, with the same sweetness of temper, directed letters about Africa. Her being so employed was, I must say, a great relief to me ; for Richard told us that he had washed his hands in a pie-dish, and that they had found the kettle on his dressing-table ; and he made Ada laugh so, that they made me laugh too in the most ridiculous manner.

Soon after seven o'clock we went down to dinner ; carefully, by Mrs. Jellyby's advice ; for the stair-carpets, besides being very deficient in stair-wires, were so torn as to be absolute traps. We had a fine cod-fish, a piece of roast beef, a dish of cutlets, and a pudding ; an excellent dinner, if it had had any cooking to speak of, but it was almost raw. The young woman with the flannel bandage waited, and dropped every thing on the table, wherever it happened to go, and never moved it again until she put it on the stairs. The person I had seen in pattens (whom I supposed to be the cook), frequently came and skirmished with her at the door, and there appeared to be ill-will between them.

All through dinner, which was long in consequence of such accidents as the dish of potatoes being mislaid on the coal-scuttle, and the handle of the corkscrew coming off, and striking the young woman on the chin : Mrs. Jellyby preserved the evenness of her disposition. She told us a great deal that was interesting about Borrioboola-Gha and the natives ; and received so many letters that Richard, who sat

by her, saw four envelopes in the gravy at once. Some of the letters were proceedings of ladies' committees, or resolutions of ladies' meetings, which she read to us; others were applications from people excited in various ways about the cultivation of coffee, and natives; others required answers, and these she sent her oldest daughter from the table three or four times to write. She was full of business, and undoubtedly was, as she told us, devoted to the cause.

No wonder, under such conditions, that the daughter wished that "Africa was dead."

It is disgraceful [she said]. You know it is. The whole house is disgraceful. I'm disgraceful. Pa's miserable, and no wonder! I wish I was dead! I wish we were all dead. It would be a great deal better for us.

And this was what came of Lady Herbert's praiseworthy attempt to get Dickens to help in Mrs. Chisholm's work. Truly, if he desired to give it a helping hand he took a somewhat peculiar way of carrying out his intentions.

Forster, in the third volume of his admirable *Life of Dickens*, treats us to an elaborate apology for his hero's habit of drawing the characters in his books from among his living experiences. In his earlier works, these instances are rare, and his biographer can only find one case where a character intended to be odious was copied wholly from a living original. This occurred in *Oliver Twist*, where Mr. Fang, the magistrate who tries Oliver, is taken from a Mr. Laing, of Hatton Garden celebrity, a notorious magisterial bully of the period, who shortly after Dickens put him in the pillory was removed from the Bench by the Home Secretary. The next case is that of Miss Mowcher, the "A'int I volatile" grotesque in *David Copperfield*. In this instance Dickens received a letter of remonstrance from the person caricatured, and he made what amends were in his power by undoing in a subsequent chapter of the novel (the 32nd), the unpleasant impression he had conveyed in the earlier pages. But it is in *Bleak House* that we have this characteristic displayed to a greater extent than in any other of his works. Forster says:

In the book that followed *Copperfield*, two characters appeared having resemblances in manner and speech to two distinguished writers too vivid to be mistaken by their personal friends. To Lawrence Boythorn, under whom Landor figured, no objection was made; but Harold Skimpole, recognizable as Leigh Hunt, led to much remark; the

difference being that ludicrous traits were employed in the case of Boythorn, to enrich without impairing an attractive person in the tale, whereas to the latter (Skimpole) was assigned a part in the plot which no fascinating foibles or gaieties of speech could redeem from contempt. Though a want of consideration was thus shown to the friend, whom the character would be likely to recall to many readers, it is, nevertheless, very certain that the intention of Dickens was not at first, or at any time, an unkind one. He erred from thoughtlessness only.

Dickens, however, sinned in the light, for Forster himself tells us that, in conjunction with another friend of Dickens, Procter (Barry Cornwall), he suggested a revision of the first sketch, "the feeling having been mine from the first that the likeness was too like." Dickens writes (17th of March, 1852), "I will go through the character again in the course of the afternoon and soften down words here and there." He writes the next day :

I have again gone over every part of it very carefully, and I think I have made it much less like. I have also changed Leonard to Harold. I have no right to give Hunt pain, and I am so bent upon not doing it that I wish you would look at all the proof once more, and indicate any place in which you feel it particularly like, whereupon I will alter that place.

Upon the whole [Forster tells us], the alterations were considerable, but the *radical wrong remained*. The pleasant, sparkling, airy talk, which could not be mistaken, identified with odious qualities a friend only known to the writer by attractive ones : and *for this there was no excuse*. Perhaps the only person acquainted with the original who failed to recognize the copy, was the original himself (a common case) ; but good-natured friends in time told Hunt everything, and painful explanations followed, where nothing was possible to Dickens but what amounted to a friendly evasion of the points really at issue.

Then follows Dickens' attempt at what most people will designate the very lamest of apologies, but which Forster prefers to call "striving to set up Hunt again in his own esteem."

Separate in your own mind [Dickens writes to Hunt] what you see of yourself from what other people tell you they see. As it has given you so much pain, I take it at its worst, and say I am deeply sorry, and that I feel I did wrong in doing it. I should otherwise have taken it at its best, and ridden off upon what I strongly feel to be the truth, that there is nothing in it that should have given you pain. Every one in writing must speak from points of his experience, and so I of mine with you : but when I have felt it was going too close I stopped myself, and the most blotted parts of my MS. are those in which I have been striving

hard to make the impression I was writing from, *unlike* you. . . . The character is not you, for there are traits in it common to fifty thousand people besides, and I did not fancy you would ever recognize it.

One cannot help feeling for Dickens in the attempt he makes to extricate himself from a difficult dilemma by this very plausible casuistry, but even the most ardent admirers of the novelist must own that Forster's charge of *friendly evasion* is more than justified, and that the whole tenor of his excuses is, to say the least, slightly disingenuous.

This peculiar phase in an otherwise admirable character seems to have become accentuated by time, as is shown in the public apology which Dickens put forth after Leigh Hunt's death. It was published in his own periodical, *All the Year Round*, and appeared December 24, 1859, entitled, "Leigh Hunt, a remonstrance." After quoting with warm approval from the Autobiography of Leigh Hunt<sup>1</sup> the touching and reverent tribute of affection from the pen of his eldest son, Dickens adds, that he makes these quotations with a special object. "It is, that a duty may be done in the most direct way possible. An act of plain, clear duty."

But instead of proceeding at once to perform this obvious, if slightly belated duty, Dickens first falls foul of an anonymous writer who had dared to state as a fact, what had been as we have seen patent to all the literary world, and most of all to Dickens himself.

Four or five years ago, the writer of these lines was much pained by accidentally encountering a printed statement, "that Mr. Leigh Hunt was the original of Harold Skimpole in *Bleak House*." The writer of these lines is the author of that book. The statement came from America. It is no disrespect to that country, in which the writer has, perhaps, as many friends and as true an interest as any man that lives, good-humouredly to state the fact, that he has now and then been the subject of paragraphs in Transatlantic newspapers, more surprisingly destitute of all foundation in truth, than the wildest delusions of the wildest lunatics. For reasons born of this experience, he let the thing go by. But since Mr. Leigh Hunt's death, the statement has been revived in England. The delicacy and generosity evinced in its revival are for the rather late consideration of its revivers.

With the full knowledge of the facts before him it was certainly *un peu fort* to characterize this statement "as baseless as

<sup>1</sup> London: Smith and Elder, 1859.



the wildest delusions of the wildest lunatics." The extravagance of the language condemns itself and shows a mind ill at ease.

The remainder of the apology is worth quoting, if for nothing else that it is one of the most effective bits of special pleading to be found, we were going to say, *in fiction*. We wonder whether Mr. Forster smiled in his sleeve when he read it. He certainly "delivered his own soul" on the subject when he recorded the episode in Dickens' Life.

Exactly those graces and charms of manner which are remembered in the words we have quoted, were remembered by the author of the work of fiction in question, when he drew the character in question. Above all things that "sort of gay and ostentatious wilfulness," in the humouring of a subject, which had many a time delighted him, and impressed him as being unspeakably whimsical and attractive, was the airy quality he wanted for the man he invented. Partly for this reason, and partly (he has since often grieved to think) for the pleasure it afforded him to find that delightful manner reproducing itself under his hand, he yielded to the temptation of too often making the character *speak* like his old friend. He no more thought, God forgive him! that the admired original would ever be charged with the imaginary vices of the fictitious creature than he has himself ever thought of charging the blood of Desdemona and Othello on the innocent Academy model who sat for Iago's leg in the picture. Even as to the mere occasional manner, he meant to be so cautious and conscientious, that he privately referred the proof-sheets of the first number of that book to two intimate literary friends of Leigh Hunt (both still living) and altered the whole of that part of the text on their discovering too strong a resemblance to his "*way*."

He cannot see the son lay the wreath on the father's tomb and leave him to the possibility of ever thinking that the present words might have righted the father's memory and were left unwritten. He cannot know that his own son may have to explain his father when folly or malice can wound his heart no more, and leave the task undone.

Admirable words! which would have been trebled in their force and effect had they been written seven years earlier, for Leigh Hunt to receive reparation as public as had been the offence.

But how does it happen that Mr. Forster, whilst thrashing out this question so thoroughly in the instances of Leigh Hunt and Landor, entirely ignores the more flagrant case of Mrs. Jellyby. Bad as was Leigh Hunt's treatment at the hands of the novelist in thus exposing him to universal contempt by the

follies and weaknesses he displays, yet most people will agree that Mrs. Jellyby has had even harsher measure meted out to her, and is held up to public contumely in a far more objectionable light. It is impossible to maintain that Forster was unaware of the facts. He was thoroughly in Dickens' confidence and was perfectly *au courant* of all the sources from which his friend drew the inspiration for his various characters. He could not fail to know a philanthropist who was in such evidence before the great world of London as was Mrs. Chisholm, and likewise Dickens' acquaintance with her. That Mrs. Chisholm was believed by the general mass of readers to be the original of Mrs. Jellyby, there is little reason to doubt. The Chisholm family themselves certainly always believed it, but far from feeling an indignation which would have been perfectly justifiable, they treated the matter rather as a joke.

To account then for Forster's reticence on the subject is difficult, save on the hypothesis that he found it impossible to make a valid excuse for the breach of good faith of which Dickens had been undoubtedly guilty in regard to Mrs. Chisholm. Truly, she asked for bread and received a stone.

I. S. SHEPARD.

### *"Weak and Beggarly Elements."*<sup>1</sup>

It is clear that the text just quoted might be taken in a sense of utter depreciation which St. Paul never meant his words to have; and as a large number of Fathers have spoken of Jewish rites, especially of their sacrifices, in a tone which sounds very depreciating, it will be worth while to give some thought to the nature of the imperfection attributable to the Old Covenant. It is with the sacrifices that we will mainly interest ourselves.

"Higher critics," as it is well known, in their arguments to show the lateness of the Priestly Code have insisted much on certain texts which may seem to show that the sacrificial system in some of its leading features was not primitive. Jeremias particularly is quoted for his utterance, "I spoke not to your fathers, and I commanded them not on the day that I brought them out of Egypt, concerning the matter of burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken to my voice and I will be your God and you shall be my people; and walk in all the way that I have commanded you."<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Amos inquires: "Did you offer victims and sacrifices to me in the desert for forty years, O house of Israel?"<sup>3</sup> Other passages in the Old Testament emphasize the fact that God wants the observance especially of the Decalogue; that He has no such need of sacrifices as was supposed in the heathen gods who were ridiculed as *λίχνοι*, positively greedy for sacrificial meats; and that the religion pleasing to Him is virtuous living.<sup>4</sup> A common reply to the difficulty is that sacrifice offered as many Jews offered it, without due dispositions or intentions, was a mockery, and that it is the style of Scripture often to seem condemnatory of a practice which it really repudiates under a certain aspect only. We shall constantly err if we take Biblical statements as wholly

<sup>1</sup> Galat. iv. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Jerem. vii. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Amos v. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Psalm xxxix. 7, xlix. 8—15, l. 18, 19; Osee vi. 5; Mich. vi. 7—9.

exclusive: for instance, it would be as qualified by promises of reward to Abraham that we should have to take, if it stood alone, the passage, "It is not for thy justice and the uprightness of thy heart that thou shalt go in to possess the lands; but because they have done wickedly they are destroyed at thy coming in." As the text stands the other truth is added, though it would have been quite *de more* to have omitted these words, "and that the Lord might accomplish His word which he promised by oath to the Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."<sup>1</sup> However, we may go beyond the reply so far suggested to meet the difficulty, and ask whether the sacrifices were not somewhat in the position of the Kingship. The latter in theocratic form is represented as part of God's own design, and yet as a measure, so to speak, forced prematurely upon Him by the urgency of the people who wanted to "have a King as the Gentiles have,"—God gave them at once a favour and a punishment attached to it, as is set forth in the First Book of Kings, chapter viii.: "Hearken to their voice: but yet testify to them and foretell them the right of the king that shall reign over them. He will take your sons and daughters and put them in his chariots, and will make them his horsemen and his running footmen to run before his chariots." Other galling exactions of the king are predicted and the consequence of them, "You shall cry out in that day from the face of the king whom you have chosen to yourselves, and the Lord will not hear you in that day, because you desired unto yourselves a king."<sup>2</sup> Did the people also do harm to their divinely appointed sacrifices by willing to have those also "as the nations" had them? Many Fathers follow in one line the assertion that the worship of the golden calf, which occurred while Moses was with God on Mount Sinai, was the determining fault which made the Jewish law less spiritual, more carnal, than it otherwise would have been. It is in this strong sense that St. Irenæus interprets a passage of Ezechiel which others strive to understand in a much milder sense: "Because they had not done my judgments and had cast off my statutes and had violated my sabbaths, and their eyes had been after the idols of their fathers. Therefore I gave them *statutes that were not good* and judgments on which they shall not live. And I polluted them in their own gifts."<sup>3</sup> The text is quoted by Irenæus as bearing out his contention that the idolatry at the foot of Sinai was a

<sup>1</sup> Deut. ix. 5.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings viii. 11—19.

<sup>3</sup> Ezech. xx. 24—26.

turning-point in Jewish ordinances. "God at first exacted nothing more than the Decalogue. But when the people went astray to worship the calf, and relapsed into their Egyptian ways of thinking, choosing to be slaves rather than freemen, He appointed for them a servitude suitable to their concupiscences, of which law Ezechiel has given the account."<sup>1</sup> Here St. Irenæus is standing midway in a stream of tradition. Barnabas may be regarded as taking a lead in the depreciation of Jewish rites:<sup>2</sup> the Epistle to Diognetes has some echo of the same voice:<sup>3</sup> the Clementines are in the same strain.<sup>4</sup> Let us quote the *Recognitions* as a specimen: "Moses the faithful and prudent Dispenser, seeing that from contact with the Egyptians the people had been infected with the vice of idolatry, and that the root of it could not be torn out, gave them a law of sacrifice."<sup>5</sup> If a more orthodox source is wanted we have it in the Apostolic Constitutions,<sup>6</sup> which teach that before the calf-worship the Decalogue was the law, afterwards the more burdensome ordinances, with the obligation of sacrifice, which before was optional. Individual Fathers may be adduced in numbers. Tertullian says that proneness to idolatry in the people had to be restrained by legitimate sacrifices:<sup>7</sup> St. Justin tells the novel story about the change introduced by the worship of the golden calf:<sup>8</sup> St. Gregory Nazienzen says that "the law was given as a wall of separation between God and idols. God granted the use of the sacrifices for a time, that afterwards He might abolish them."<sup>9</sup> St. Cyril of Alexandria represents them as a concession to weakness contracted during the sojourn in Egypt.<sup>10</sup> St. Jerome writes, "After the idolatry of the calf, God ordered sacrifice to be made rather to Himself than to demons, thus taking away the pure religion of the Commandments and permitting bloody sacrifices."<sup>11</sup> St. Augustine has a like sentence: "Because of the fleshliness of the people sacrifices were given to it such as would keep it from falling away into idolatry."<sup>12</sup> In St. Gregory the Great the doctrine appears stripped of these elements which make it less acceptable: he tells how in Egypt the Jews had taken a taint from heathen sacrifices and how God gave them these sacrifices

<sup>1</sup> iv. c. 15, n. 1. Cf. c. 17 and c. 18.

<sup>2</sup> cc. 2—17.

<sup>3</sup> c. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Homil. iii. n. 45, and n. 56.

<sup>5</sup> Lib. i. c. 36.

<sup>6</sup> Lib. i. c. 6, and Lib. vi. 20.

<sup>7</sup> Adv. Marc. ii. 18.

<sup>8</sup> Dialog. 19, 22.

<sup>9</sup> Orat. xlv. 12.

<sup>10</sup> Contra Julian, Lib. ix. col. 974 apud Migne, tom. lxxvi.

<sup>11</sup> In Jerem. vii. 21.

<sup>12</sup> In Joan. Tract. x. n. 4.

in a purified form to keep them away from what was contaminating.<sup>1</sup>

In the above extracts, so far as they contain the view that God at first designed to bestow upon His people the simple rule of the Decalogue without the obligation of a sacrificial system entailing bloodshed, and that sacrifices were imposed in consequence of the worship paid to the golden calf, we do not find the theory satisfactory, as coming from men who took the Pentateuch for strictly Mosaic legislation. Critics to-day have so upset the chronology of the several parts, that often we can hardly venture to call one part of the law prior to another. But if, with the authorities above quoted, we simply take Exodus as it stands, we find the incident of the calf not mentioned till chapter xxxii., when in previous chapters we find God revealing to Moses a sacrificial system which the latter was to communicate to the people after his descent from the mount, at some suitable time, nearer or more remote. How, then, can it be assumed that the act of idolatry was the cause of the precepts about sacrifice? The people had set out on their journey after the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, and with that rite raised to a permanent institution: "This day shall be for a memorial to you: and you shall keep it a feast to the Lord in your generations with an everlasting observance."<sup>2</sup> Hence it is wonderful that a number of interpreters, accepting the Book of Exodus as chronologically in sequence, should have assigned to the idolaters at the foot of Mount Sinai an influence so strong in fixing upon the Jews a burden to offer daily sacrifices of blood.

St. Thomas is correct in attributing to the Jewish rites, as a secondary effect, a restraining power against the tendency to idolatrous worship, while he puts in the first place the efficacy of the rites themselves to signify and convey the highest worship to God, not, as Jowett contends, a lower worship answering rather to animal instinct than to spiritual perceptions and inclinations. St. Thomas mentions also the typical force of the rites as foreshadowing the sacrifice of the Cross. The substance of the article is this:

The ceremonies of the Old Law had a double sense, one literal by which they were ordained to the divine worship, the other figurative or

<sup>1</sup> *Lib. Moral.* xxvii. cap. 18, n. 41.

<sup>2</sup> Exodus xii. 14.

mystic by which they were ordained to point forward to Christ. The former head is subdivisible into two, of which this is the first. By sacrifice is signified the right directing of the mind to God, in which is included a recognition that whatever a man has, he holds from God, the First Principle of all things, to whom also he refers everything as to his Last End. Under the second subdivision comes the idea of sacrifice paid to God as sole God, so that idolatrous sacrifices offered to images are excluded. Hence the precepts concerning sacrifices were not given to the Jewish people till they had fallen away into idolatry by adoring the golden calf.<sup>1</sup>

It is true the precepts were not promulgated till after the idolatrous act, but to Moses some parts of them were entrusted for promulgation before he discovered the defection of his people.<sup>2</sup>

The Epistle to the Hebrews is moderate in its statements of the imperfections to be found in the Old Law and in its sacrifices. The law was not perfect: "It brought nothing to perfection;"<sup>3</sup> it was a covenant that was "not faultless;"<sup>4</sup> its priests were mortal and therefore always changing because of their "infirmity" (*ἀσθένειαν*), and the sacrifices which they offered had continuously to be repeated because of their inefficiency, even their very sufficiency itself not reaching further than a legal purification. Their spiritual power to sanctify was due merely to their typical character, by anticipation they were allowed to be accompanied by some of the grace which was to be merited by Christ when He came. All these defects are contrasted with the perfect law of Christ, whose covenant is without fault, whose priesthood is eternal, whose sacrifice once offered is all-sufficing, who gives to souls real sanctification and full access to God in Heaven.

One saying of St. Peter is forcible: "Why tempt you God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?"<sup>5</sup> If fact was a proof of possibility, the law was too much for Jewish observance, especially when the Pharisaic additions were accepted, of which St. Paul had experience. He tells how the law, imposing burdens which it did not give men the strength to bear, became

<sup>1</sup> 1a-2a, quest. c. ii. a. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Exodus xxiii. 18; xxi. 5-10; xxvii. Cf. xxix. xxx.

<sup>3</sup> vii. 19.

<sup>4</sup> ἀμετέωρος, vii. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xv. 10 Cf. vii. 53; St. John vii. 19.



an occasion of sin, even though in itself it was a good law, because it was from God. "The commandment that was ordained to life, the same to me was found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, seduced me, and by it killed me. Wherefore the law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was that then which was good, made death to me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, by that which is good, wrought death in me; that sin by the commandment might become sinful above measure."<sup>1</sup>

J. R.

<sup>1</sup> Romans vii. 10-13.

## *A Visit to Monte Cassino.*

---

NEXT to Subiaco, where the great St. Benedict laid the foundations of his sanctity, the spot which is dearest to his spiritual children, is Monte Cassino—the sanctuary whence issued his gracious Rule, the witness of his wondrous miracles, the shrine of his precious remains. When, in the course of a recent visit to Rome, occasion offered for a pilgrimage to the hallowed spot, it was with thankful joy that I embraced it. St. Benedict belongs to the whole world; for the history of his Order is identical with that of the Church at large—so wide its ramifications and universal its influence throughout successive ages. It is for this reason that I venture to record for the benefit of the general reader the impressions produced by the visit in question.

Trains in Italy are not remarkable for speed, and it took three hours to travel from Rome to S Germano. The scenery on the route was decidedly interesting. A fortified castle with mediæval towers and battlements, or a cluster of smaller buildings, or, it might be a village with a church in the heart of it, raised aloft upon some hill—now rough and craggy, now begirt with forest verdure—was a constantly recurring feature of the landscape. Alighting at the little station, I saw, far up the heights of the mountain, whose top, as St. Gregory says, “seemeth to touch the very heavens,” the long range of the fortress-like buildings which comprise the historical abbey. The station, by the way, though but half a mile or so from the small town of S. Germano, has been styled Cassino; whether this is an attempt to revive the ancient name dating from classical antiquity, or, what is more probable, merely a shrewd stroke of advertisement on the part of the railway authorities, does not appear.

Waiting outside the station were six or eight flimsy-looking open carriages in a long line, all abreast, and as soon as I appeared the drivers, recognizing the familiar monastic garb, began one and all to crack their whips and with praiseworthy

emulation to invite attention to each one's own particular vehicle, as they shouted in chorus, "Alla Badia, Signor?" or its equivalent. But I had been well instructed as to the correct procedure. A wiry little dapple-grey pony took my fancy, and I signalled to his willing driver to approach. "Il tariffa?" I asked, with a business-like air. "Tre lire, Signor," was the prompt reply. "Bene," said I, as I took my seat. Three francs was, as I knew, a very modest fare, but evidently trade was very slack just then. I was prepared for a petition for "drink money" at the end of the journey, for I had heard of ten or even twelve francs being asked for that same drive.

S. Germano must strike everyone as a thoroughly sleepy little place, with an old-world air about it. As we rattled along its roughly paved streets, such of the inhabitants as were not already basking in the cooler air of the late afternoon would run out to gaze after us and pass a remark (evidently) as to our business and destination, with all the readiness of people who met with little to disturb the placid monotony of life in an Italian village. We halted at the open window of a small shop, and the driver, with a murmured apology, alighted and purchased a candle. I fondly imagined it was for his own return journey, for it was then but four o'clock; however, I discovered my mistake before very long. Very soon we had left the houses behind and were bravely ascending the mountain which bore the monastery on its crest.

The splendid carriage-way by which, in these days, the traveller climbs the seventeen hundred feet of rock, is of comparatively modern construction. It winds about in gradually ascending sweeps round two faces of the steep incline, crossing at frequent intervals the earlier and more direct path. This latter, formerly the only route by which even popes and kings were able to reach the abbey, is but a narrow bridle-road, washed bare, in many places, to its massive foundation-slabs by the winter torrents which sweep like cataracts down its decidedly steep gradient. It can be ascended on foot only, or on the back of a mule or donkey.

Very early in our progress we passed the chief remains of the classic town of Casinum; this is a small but comparatively perfect amphitheatre, lying below the road not far from the station. Higher up, in the opposite direction, the splendid old mediæval ruin of Rocca Janula crowns a projecting spur immediately over S. Germano; a long range of battlemented wall

connecting the fortress with the town beneath. The grim old castle is famous in history for having sustained two sieges against the Emperor Frederick II. It also served as a prison for the Antipope Burdino, who styled himself Gregory VII., when he tried to usurp the throne of Gelasius II.

An hour's climbing seemed to bring us little nearer the huge buildings which loomed from the heights still far above us. Vehicle, horse, and man formed such an odd combination that I had often hard work to preserve the gravity befitting my condition. The carriage looked so fragile that there seemed room for fear lest it should collapse under me. The driver, a handsome young fellow, somewhat shabbily attired, but resplendent in a magnificent twisted moustache of many inches, was most anxious to engage in conversation from the box-seat, but was promptly repelled by the announcement that I was English ; for the rest of the journey he was fain to relieve his feelings and his enforced silence by a frequent long-drawn "Ah!"—like a too audible sigh—or by energetic appeals, which were always coolly disregarded, to his dapple-grey steed. The latter was the most absurd feature of the turn-out. He was small and spare of build, and wore what seemed to me an utterly incongruous amount of trappings, studded over with brass nails as though he might have but just stepped out of a circus procession. To add to the resemblance, he bore on his head a ridiculous plume—in shape like a much-worn, dirty, white and red feather-brush—which nodded an accompaniment to his paces. He was a delusive animal, too ; for although at starting he had made a pretence of showing that he meant to do the whole distance at a steady trot, he soon relapsed into a sleepy crawl, which nothing, not even whip and voice together, could succeed in quickening for longer than a few seconds of time.

Deluded by the sunny heat which had rendered Rome, even in November, decidedly oppressive to a northerner, I had brought no wraps of any kind ; half-way up the ascent, I bitterly regretted the folly, for the sun had set and a chill wind blew freezingly cold. Soon the short, southern twilight gave place to darkness. With the light of the solitary candle to guide us from the lamp in which it had been fixed, we plodded drearily upwards, the "circus-horse" by this time thoroughly demoralized and impervious to all expostulation. It was with grateful joy that after two hours of leisurely climbing I saw through the gloom the long range of lighted windows within measurable

distance above us, and at length we halted at the abbey gate.

The two chief points of interest at Monte Cassino are the tomb of St. Benedict, where his remains are still venerated, and the actual portion of the ancient buildings in which he spent so many years of his life. The former lies under the high altar of the splendid basilica erected in the seventeenth century. The altar itself is rich in priceless marbles disposed in the mosaic work known as *pietra dura*. Behind it, facing the monastic choir, is an ornamental balustrade of metal which encloses a space of almost semicircular shape paved with costly stones; this marks the sacred spot where lie the bodies of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica—the twin brother and sister, who both devoted their lives to God in the monastic state, and dying within a few weeks of each other, were laid to rest, as a short Latin epitaph records, in the same grave. The balustrade supports a circle of ever-burning lamps.

Descending a flight of steps on one side, the pilgrim reaches the crypt, which was hewn out of the rock in the sixteenth century, and extends under the choir of the basilica. Below the rough stone which marks the tomb containing the precious relics, an altar generally stands. At the time of my visit the crypt was entirely dismantled, and undergoing restoration at the hands of some of the clever monastic artists who carried out the decoration of another portion of the buildings some twenty years ago. Formerly this underground church possessed frescoes by a rare artist, Marco da Siena, a painter of the sixteenth century, but the damp injured them irretrievably, and after being frequently touched up they have been entirely removed. Some beautifully carved choir-stalls, worked in dark walnut-wood by Benvenuto da Brescia, formed part of the original fittings. The crypt is now being adorned entirely with marbles and mosaics, and when completed will be of unique, yet chaste splendour. The present Pope has contributed generously towards the expenses of the costly work, and the kindly, courteous Abbot, when I was at Monte Cassino, was, to my great regret, absent in America for the purpose of soliciting the alms of his Benedictine brethren towards the same end, in the country which had witnessed the early years of his own monastic life.

Comparatively modern as are the surroundings of St. Benedict's tomb, the memories—which no changes can efface—

attaching to the hallowed spot are multitudinous and overwhelming. Hither have journeyed as humble suppliants the great ones of the earth—popes, emperors, and kings. While princes of the blood have here exchanged the symbols of royalty for the cowl of the monk, more than one lowly son of St. Benedict has been taken hence to fill, unwillingly, St. Peter's Chair. Again and again have both church and monastery been laid in ruins, and as often have they sprung into new life, richer and greater than ever. And through all the ages, crowds of devout pilgrims have scaled the rugged mountain and ascended on their knees the forty stone steps of the outer court, as well as those leading to the shrine itself, that with due external reverence they might approach to offer their prayers and oblations to their beloved Saints.

It is impossible for even the most minute description to convey an adequate idea of the magnificence of the basilica which has risen over the ashes of St. Benedict and his sister. It measures from entrance to high altar some one hundred and sixty feet. Its walls, arches, and side chapels are encrusted with priceless marbles in inlaid work. So beautiful are these that they are judged equal to the renowned marbles of the Certosa of Pavia, which surpass anything of the kind to be found even in St. Peter's at Rome. Massive marble columns adorn the huge piers of *pietra dura* which support the arches; overhead in the lofty vault of the roof, as well as in the chapels of the nave and the lower part of the dome which rises over the sanctuary, are paintings by artists of renown. When the difficulties which had to be surmounted in conveying materials hither are taken into account, the wonder of the beholder increases ten-fold. For in the early part of the eighteenth century, when the present church was being built, the only road up the mountain was the narrow mule-track still to be seen, and the only means of carrying up the stone and marble needed for the work was on the backs of animals.

The choir, which is behind the altar, is of equal splendour. Its elaborately-carved stalls of late seventeenth century work are magnificent specimens of Renaissance art. Among those who took part in their construction was the Roman sculptor, Colicci, an artist of note. Several large paintings by Francesco Solinus adorn the walls, and a fine organ of the same date as the building stands at the end of the choir. A unique collection of illuminated choral books of the sixteenth century

is preserved here; the books are still used in the choir offices.

The sacristy is rich in carved frescoes of elaborate design, and in several eighteenth century mural paintings, but its most interesting feature is the ancient marble mosaic pavement, similar in style to that in the older Roman churches. This is almost the only portion remaining of the church built by Abbot Desiderius, afterwards Pope Victor III., in the eleventh century. An arm-bone of St. Benedict is preserved here among other precious relics.

Interesting and beautiful as are the surroundings of his tomb, they must yield in artistic taste to the adornments of the ancient building in which tradition locates the monastic cell and those other apartments which have been consecrated by St. Benedict's living presence. The square tower above one of the entrances cannot be distinguished in its modern dress from the block of buildings of which it now forms part, yet it is the only portion which dates back to the sixth century. In 1880, in commemoration of the fourteenth centenary of the Saint's birth, its two or three stories with the chambers contained within them were restored and beautified. The decorations were designed and carried out by Benedictine Fathers forming the Art School of the Congregation of Beuron, whose mural paintings have since become more widely known. It is impossible to describe fittingly the majestic beauty of the figures in these frescoes, or the wonderful harmony of colours in the decorations generally—for every inch of wall space is decorated; yet no account of Monte Cassino would be complete without some reference to these striking specimens of truly Christian art. The work of restoration necessitated many changes in the division of the ancient building; modern walls were in some instances removed, and the old construction of the tower reproduced by means of indications discovered in the masonry. It is now divided into twelve compartments; some of these, however, are mere staircases and vestibules to more important rooms.

The visitor enters first an antechamber, in the middle of which stands a large, font-shaped vessel for holy water. The walls here bear groups of figures in greenish-grey monochrome; chief among them are St. Gregory, the narrator of St. Benedict's life, and Peter the Deacon, to whom reference is continually made in the Dialogues wherein that life is recorded. The chief



painting is one of great beauty, in which are depicted the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, together with Moses, Elias, and Eliseus. They recall St. Gregory's comparison of St. Benedict with these particular Saints, in demonstration that he was filled with the spirit of all the just; they are, moreover, alluded to in the proper Sequence of the Mass for St. Benedict's feast. Scrolls above the figures specify the particular virtues of which they are types—faith, obedience, temperance, chastity, mildness, abstinence, and zeal, respectively. The faces are all of superhuman beauty, and the colours wonderfully chosen; when it is understood that the figures in all the large paintings are of more than life size, some idea may be gained of the magnitude of the undertaking as a whole.

The second chamber is much larger, and is divided by a deep circular arch into two portions. The frescoes commence the series of incidents in the life of St. Benedict which are continued in the successive apartments. Several of his miracles are here represented in monochrome. Though the pictures themselves are subdued in tone, the varied designs which decorate walls and ceilings, and the majestic angelic figures of the archway are portrayed in the richest colours. The third room, in addition to similar beautiful groups in monochrome, possesses a glowing picture of King David with his harp; for this compartment is sometimes used as choir to the adjoining room, which is raised on a higher level and contains an altar. It is in this fourth room that the glorious picture of the death of St. Benedict—since frequently reproduced in photographs—occupies one of the walls, while over the altar is to be seen the no less beautiful Crucifixion group which has won for this compartment of the tower the title of "Chapel of the Crucifixion." Besides the figures of our Lady and St. John, those of St. Benedict, St. Scholastica, St. John Baptist, and St. Martin are represented; it was to the two latter, it will be remembered, that the holy Patriarch of Monks dedicated the first oratories he built upon the mountain. The decorations of the ceiling here are of striking beauty; angelic figures, suggested by some of the ancient mosaics in S. Prassede in Rome, occupy a prominent position.

The chamber next in succession is one of the most interesting, from the traditions associated with it. From its window is gained a view of the valley where stand the remains of the ancient nunnery occupied by St. Scholastica and her

religious sisters. It was from this window that St. Benedict witnessed the flight of the white dove heavenward—the token of his sister's death and speedy reward; here too he beheld the wondrous vision of the whole world gathered together under one ray of light, and that of the ascent to Heaven of St. Germanus of Capua. It is most fitting, therefore, that one of the chief paintings here should portray the last meeting between brother and sister, three days before the latter's death. In this chapel the Blessed Sacrament is reserved; over the altar is a fine fresco of our Lady surrounded by angels and saints.

Richly decorated vestibules and staircase lead to a lower stage of the tower. Immediately under the Blessed Sacrament chapel just mentioned is the small chamber which tradition points out as the very cell occupied by St. Benedict. No Catholic, much less a spiritual son of the great Saint, can visit this blessed spot unmoved. Its memories fill the soul with a sense of trembling awe. It was here that the monastic law-giver wrote his immortal Rule; here that he spent those long hours in silent prayer with tears; here, above all, that at his prayer—as of another Eliseus—the soul returned to the crushed and mangled body of the boy-monk and he stood upon his feet again, alive and whole.

All the fittings of this impressive little sanctuary are appropriately grave and severe. The colours employed are of more subdued tone and the decorations of more simple form than in any of the other chambers. Over the stone altar, carved with designs of chaste simplicity, is enthroned a seated statue of the Saint, cast in bronze—a splendidly severe figure of more than life size. Along each of the side walls hang lamps of antique shape containing ever-burning lights. It was a privilege highly valued to be permitted to say Mass in this sacred place.

I have touched upon the two spots around which centre all the interests of Monte Cassino—those consecrated by his living presence and by his dead body. It remains now to sketch briefly the chief features in the buildings which have sprung up around them. The monastery is of vast extent; its present buildings date chiefly from the period of the erection of the church and are symmetrical rather than beautiful exteriorly. There are, however, earlier portions. The grand entrance to the basilica, which is one of them, is most imposing.

A spacious courtyard in the centre is surrounded on three of its sides by noble porticoes of circular arches, and on the fourth by the magnificent flight of steps leading to a smaller court which serves as the *atrium* of the church. On either side of the central court are similar quadrangles surrounded by arcades. The whole of this portion was designed in the early part of the sixteenth century by the celebrated Bramante, one of the architects employed upon the protracted work of the building of St. Peter's at Rome. At the foot of the marble staircase stand colossal figures of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica, placed there two centuries later. The porticoes which separate the quadrangles, and that which closes the central court on the side opposite to the steps, are surmounted by open-air paths, protected by stone balustrades. From that on the summit of the latter may be gained so magnificent a view of mountain scenery that it has received the name of "*Loggia del Paradiso*." At the date of my visit the central court and its adjoining arcades were thronged with workmen busily engaged in cutting into shape the blocks of marble destined for the restoration of the crypt.

The smaller quadrangle immediately in front of the basilica has also an arcading round it, on the walls of which are statues of various notable benefactors of the abbey—Popes, sovereigns, and nobles. The columns of these arcades are of marble, and are said to have once formed part of an ancient temple of Apollo. The chief door of the church is adorned with bronze plates, bearing in raised silver letters the list of the possessions of Monte Cassino in the eleventh century; they were brought from Constantinople for the building raised by Abbot Desiderius.

The Diocesan Seminary occupies a considerable portion of one large wing. The ecclesiastical students being educated here under the rectorship of one of the Fathers are chiefly intended for the diocese, containing about a hundred thousand souls, of which for centuries the Abbot of Monte Cassino has been the administrator. The students number some seventy or eighty; their presence enhances the solemnity of the great functions celebrated in the basilica.

There is a great deal beside what has been here recorded, to interest a visitor to this renowned abbey. Like so many of the religious houses of Italy, it has been seized by the Government as public property, the Fathers being regarded as mere

caretakers. But, in spite of this, Monte Cassino continues to receive novices, and to maintain a vigorous monastic life. Much might be said about the unostentatious but solid work in the way of literary research which is being carried on within its walls. The late Abbot Tosti, of world-wide fame, the cherished friend of Gladstone, has a worthy successor in his literary work in the person of the claustral Prior, Dom Ambrogio Amelli. The magnificent library of twenty thousand volumes, the priceless manuscripts of its archives, the few fine paintings which still remain—for the bulk of such art-treasures have been carried off by the Government to Naples: these and a host of other attractions would furnish matter for a more minute description than can be attempted here.

When the time came to take leave of the venerable abbey, I found that two of my fellow-guests intended to walk down to the station, and they gave me an invitation to join them. So we started off, down the steep track leading towards S. Germano, whose yellow walls shone far beneath us, their windows blinking in the blazing sunshine. I had dreaded the descent all alone; for unpleasant reminiscences would keep recurring of a huge white Campagna dog, ferocious and strong, which on the way up had dashed out upon the carriage from a wayside farm, and had seemed to regard the driver's sturdy lashings as fresh provocations for barking and snarling and the grim baring of savage fangs. However, as luck would have it, we met no dog on our way down except a shabby little yellow cur, that seemed more terrified than warlike, for he retreated into the recesses of a vineyard as we drew near, barking vociferously the while, but never attempting otherwise to molest us.

It was a morning in early November, yet the temperature on the side of the mountain was that of a July afternoon in northern climes, and there was little shade along the dreary road, for the vegetation was limited almost entirely to aloes. The only relief to eyes wearied with the blinding glare reflected from the white stones beneath our feet was the scene on the opposite side of the valley, where the lovely mountain ranges of Terra di Lavoro shone in the clear morning light with a thousand soft and varied hues. But the longest journey has its end, and after plodding along patiently through the heat we reached in due time the shady streets of S. Germano, and before long were speeding on our way back to Rome.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O.S.B.

## *The Politics of the English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.*

---

### NO. IV.—THE POLITICAL CRISIS. 1583 to 1588.

IN the last study on this subject, the steps were indicated by which the lay and clerical representatives of the English Catholic party came to regard the change of government in Scotland, by which King James shook himself free in 1581 from the Anglo-Protestant party, as a favourable opportunity for precipitating the inevitable struggle between the dominant Protestant minority and the Catholics. For weak and disorganized as the Catholics in England were by themselves, they were strong in this, that Spain, France and Scotland had all of them good cause to quarrel with their Queen. If these powers could but mutually understand one another and agree on some common plan of action, they would be irresistible. Allen and Persons with their confederates thought that the circumstances justified them in promoting this mutual understanding and co-operation, even at the cost of involving themselves in political negotiations, which we must condemn as unwarrantable, though sanctioned by Catholic contemporaries as "affairs of religion."

The present article will be devoted to considering the advent of the political crisis which was foreseen in 1581, so as to trace the steps by which Philip finally found himself obliged to send out his "great Armada" against Elizabeth, and to ascertain so far as possible what was the position of the various groups of English Catholics (*i.e.* the English exiles lay and clerical, the friends of Mary, and the Catholics at home), towards Spain and Elizabeth as the great crisis drew near.

The plans which had been accepted by the Conferences at Paris in May, 1582, "fell to the ground," as we have heard Persons say, with the capture of James by the Anglo-Protestant party in the "Raid of Ruthven" in August, 1582. Under these

circumstances it was but natural that they should be resumed, when the Prince recovered his liberty in June, 1583, and showed himself as earnest in his mother's cause as could be desired. The negotiations of Allen and Persons with the Papal Nuncio and Spanish agent, were therefore then taken up again, exactly at the point at which they had been broken off in the previous autumn. In August, 1583, there were fresh consultations in Paris after which Crichton was sent to Spain and Persons to Rome.

The latter obtained from the Pope on this occasion a Brief (which, however, was never published or put into force) renewing the excommunication against the Queen. This was the most hostile measure which had yet been taken against her. The six lords in 1581, as we have seen, provided for nothing more extreme than a change of cabinet, to be attained by risings in England and Scotland. The conferences at Paris in May, 1582, went a step farther and requested foreign aid. Now the Queen's excommunication was contemplated,<sup>1</sup> and by implication therefore her deposition, which, so far as one can see, was not part of the earlier plans.

These missions led to no practical results by reason of the wretched financial condition of the Catholic powers. The English fugitives hoped that 200,000 or 300,000 crowns would have sufficed, and Philip, though he answered Crichton's messages ambiguously, left Allen and the rest under the impression that he would eventually do as they had proposed. But by June, 1584, they had begun to put the only possible interpretation on the continued refusal of his officials to provide the subsidies which had been promised. "The English and Scotch, who were acquainted with the enterprise, have evidently given up hope."<sup>2</sup> So wrote the Papal Nuncio from Paris on June 24th; on the 6th of August the same Nuncio was informed by the Spanish Ambassador, Taxis, that Philip now estimated the cost of the expedition at 2,000,000 crowns, and that he must wait for the present. By the autumn of 1584, therefore, the

<sup>1</sup> It has been said that Gregory renewed the excommunication against Elizabeth, at the time of the Irish expedition. This is proved to be an error by its renewal in 1583, without any mention of the previous reissue of the sentence. The least untrustworthy account which I have found as to the origin of this error, is that which states that the Cardinal of Alessandria reprinted the Bull early in 1580, as a sort of warning to the Duke of Anjou, who was then courting Elizabeth. R. Simpson, *Edmund Campion*, p. 231. For an instance of the malicious use of this reprint, see J. Morris, *Life of Father J. Gerard*, p. 220.

<sup>2</sup> T. F. Knox, *Letters of Cardinal Allen*, p. 424.

plans of August, 1583, for the restoration of Catholicism by force of arms might be considered antiquated.

It was certainly a great misfortune for the Anglo-Spanish party that Philip and the Pope were not far more decided in their declarations of inability to do what was requested of them. But Spain's resources were enormous, limited, it seemed, only by her want of business capacity. Limits of that sort are hard to define, and are rarely realized by those who are bad managers. Thus it came that Spain misled her own friends, and deceived them more than others. Father Crichton, for instance, when captured at sea by English pirates, in September, 1584, had with him the plan for the invasion of England, which had been formed in 1583, and was based on hopes of Spanish help. Since then, "those who were acquainted with the enterprise, had given up hope," and still Crichton had taken the paper with him, as though it were a document of value! This may be another case of Father Crichton's imprudence. It may also be that the guilty person was the Bishop of Ross; for a Scottish priest, Ady, who was captured on the same ship as Crichton, had with him a keg, full of the Bishop's publications.

To return to the main course of our history. At the very moment when Philip was distinctly hanging back, a series of accidents occurred, which accentuated the quarrel between himself and Elizabeth, eliminated allies on either side, and in the end made all depend on the struggle for the mastery of the sea.

(1) The French could take no further part in the quarrel after 1584. On the 10th of June of that year died the Duke of Alençon, last male heir of the house of Valois. This rendered a war of succession inevitable, for the nearest heir (Henry of Bourbon) was then a Protestant holding the opinion, *Cuius regio, illius religio*, i.e., the King should settle the religion of the country. He could therefore only hope to gain a Catholic throne by force of arms. A war in France would prevent the French Catholics from aiding Mary of Scotland or Philip of Spain, and the French Protestants from causing diversions in Elizabeth's favour by attacking the Spaniards in the Netherlands.

(2) Scotland withdrew from the conflict in 1585. James had perhaps never been more favourable to war with England than in May, 1584. He had then summoned up courage to put the



Earl of Gowrie to death for attacking him at Stirling, almost the only attempt at rebellion on the part of the Anglo-Protestant party which failed of success! But James's ardour cooled as he compared the forces of Elizabeth pressing on his borders with the distant armies of Spain, which, though great, were immobile, and afforded him no assistance. Pay for a much needed body-guard was promised him by Philip, but in four years only a quarter of the sum guaranteed had been paid. James's courtiers too were venal in the highest degree. At the close of 1584 his agent, the Master of Grey, was won over by England, by the May following the Scottish King was treating with Elizabeth for a pension, and in October he was captured once again by the Protestants. From henceforth, whatever James's sympathies may have been, the possibility of Scotland being made the base for a war upon England was at an end.

(3) Other events brought Spain and England to open war. The Prince of Orange was assassinated on July 10th, 1584, the Prince of Parma made steady progress towards pacifying Flanders, and Spain seemed at last about to gain a great preponderance there, especially after the fall of Antwerp in the August of 1585. Elizabeth's government therefore took the decided step of assuming the protection of the Low countries, and of carrying on war openly against Spain. Philip still dissembled, and might perhaps have done so for an indefinite period, had not Drake's ravages at sea at last forced him into action. "Drake," as even the patriotic Mr. Seeley admits, "convinced Spain that in self-defence she must crush England."<sup>1</sup>

In his unbusinesslike way Philip endeavoured to fit out an armada strong enough to cover Parma's flotilla of small craft, and to make an invasion possible in spite of the acknowledged pre-eminence of the English navy. Those who were behind the scenes (as the dispatches of the Papal Nuncio in Spain show), knew but too well how ill-organized and badly officered the fleet was, and that the "only hope" lay in the Prince of Parma's army. But the calamity which befell the expedition exceeded their worst fears. Henceforth Elizabeth was (in modern phrase) "intangible." Plans for upsetting her throne by war and revolution are no longer seriously entertained.

Of the many important aspects under which the Spanish

<sup>1</sup> J. R. Seeley, *Growth of British Policy*, i. 206; Hübner, *Sixtus the Fifth*, i. 356.

war is to be considered, that which most concerns us is this, that it came eventually to be a struggle between two maritime nations for power at sea. It cannot properly be called a war for religion, though both combatants were animated by religious sentiments, and both attributed the result to special providence or miracle. The religious motives for fighting had existed for thirty years without moving Philip to break the peace, and they were weaker in 1588 than they had been in many preceding years.

The form of attack again did not correspond with what the English Catholics had asked in the past. Nothing that any English Catholic could have done or omitted, would have stayed its sailing, or altered its course. It was not for them that the fleet sailed, except secondarily and remotely. Some of their number wished the Armada well, regarding it as their last chance of regaining their liberties and returning to their homes. Some actually fought against it, believing it to be an unjust attack upon those very homes and liberties. Our present object is to study this difference of opinion, to see how it originated, and what proportion of the Catholics espoused the one side and the other. And first we may attend to the party of Allen and Persons.

After Persons, who, as we have seen, had been sent to Rome in September, 1583, by the Catholic conference at Paris, rejoined his friends in that city, a period of disillusionment, and of endeavour to get free from political entanglement ensued. Paris itself was unsafe for him. His friend, Richard Verstegan, was thrown into prison at the request of the English Ambassador, and Persons found it necessary to live in disguise, away from Jesuit houses, under the *aliases* of Ricardo Melino or Eusebius.

Sometimes he was writing and printing books at Rheims and Rouen, sometimes he betook himself to Flanders, where he had something to do with the incorporation of two or three score of the fugitives into the "English Regiment" by the Prince of Parma. Here, too, he saw something of the horrors of war, and had twice to ride for his life. On one occasion his baggage and papers fell into the enemy's hands.

His letters of this time reflect the difficulties he had to fight against. They are chiefly concerned with the difficulties of the Jesuit missionaries, because of the persecution in England. He also laboured much to raise alms for the Seminaries and for the exiles. The correspondence on political subjects testifies

to the decline of the hopes and aims of his party. The most important piece is a memorial from Allen and himself to the Pope and King of Spain, January 16th, 1584, urging promptitude.<sup>1</sup> In spite of Throckmorton's confessions, they say, very little is yet known of the Catholic plans. Taking all into consideration, the situation was "never better," but delay could never be more hurtful.

Delays, however, grew more and more serious, until, as we have heard the Nuncio in Paris say, the original plan for the "Enterprise," was despaired of in June, and formally renounced by Philip in August. The prevalent discouragement was reflected in a letter of July 24th from Persons to Sir Francis Englefield, in which, after some gloomy comments on the want of union in the Catholic party, he concludes by saying :

If I cold be ridd of the whole, it would be a great ease and contentment to me, so all partes were satisfied.<sup>2</sup>

When towards the end of the year Philip once more held out hopes that he might assist, Father Persons wrote as follows to Queen Mary :

. . . Dr. Allen and I had concluded—upon consideration of our thwarts and oppositions that we receive daily in all our doings, and [that from] men of our side,<sup>3</sup> and of the small success our former labours had brought forth,—we had resolved, I say, to leave cogitation of such matters and to follow only our spiritual course, whereupon all dependeth though in longer time. We persuaded ourselves that God would never permit such lets and hindrances from among ourselves, except His Divine Providence did foresee that it was not yet time to relieve us temporally. I mourned, and being in this cogitation and determination, Mr. Owen arrived who brought us new order and commandment from the King of Spain to renew or rather continue our suit to the Prince of Parma. . . . This message brought some hope that they may have some meaning to deal in the enterprise in the end, whereof we did fully despair, and much more the answer of your Majesty, at the very instant when I least expected the same, gave some hope again.<sup>4</sup>

These letters, which should be read in connection with Allen's published letters of the same period, show the modified aims and aspirations entertained by the Anglo-Spanish party

<sup>1</sup> Knox, *Allen's Letters*, pp. 222, lxi.

<sup>2</sup> R.O. *Mary Queen of Scots*, xiii. 36.

<sup>3</sup> The reference is probably to the vexatious delays of Philip's officials, but the troubles caused by Paget and Morgan will also be alluded to.

<sup>4</sup> R.O. *ut supra*, n. 57, undated.

at this time. We hear no more from them of missions to the Pope and King of Spain, of plans for the "Enterprise." The book which most fully represents their views at this moment is Dr. Allen's *True, Sincere, and Modest defence of English, Catholiques, that suffer for their Faith, both at home and abroad*. In this he declares that "manie Catholiques were sorie" that Sanders and Bristow had used less moderation than other Catholic writers, and mentions approvingly the fact that James Laburne had found no followers in his declaration that Elizabeth, by her heresy, had forfeited her right to the throne. The writer's object is to inculcate patience,<sup>1</sup> to sue for liberty of conscience and toleration, not to prepare the ground for a war of religion, or to excite Elizabeth's enemies to invade her realm.

It will not, I hope, be considered a digression, if I here make some rather lengthy extracts from the letters and instructions issued at this juncture by the Father General of the Society of Jesus. The first two extracts do indeed refer to the political schemes of the English Catholics, but they are the only passages of the sort which I have found.

The rest of the correspondence refers to the English Jesuit mission, but the tone in which it is written is worthy of our consideration here. Work undertaken and executed in the spirit of these letters will never have been primarily, or aggressively political in character. It is by these commands, not by Persons' execution of them, that the merits and demerits of the Order in these affairs must be decided.

The following message refers to the plan of the "Enterprise" made in May, 1582, and we see indirectly how and why Aquaviva approved of that plan.

*Aquaviva to Persons, Rome, June 5, 1583.* "As to the chief matter, when your Reverence meets Father Crichton, you will learn from him the state in which it was when he left. The Pope always shows the strongest desire of promoting it, but only in that way which he thinks that he can, that is, by granting a subsidy in money. He cannot be persuaded, it seems, to do more than this. We do not therefore see what more we can do, except to commend the whole affair to God, which you may be sure that we do."

The next letter is addressed to the French Provincial, and regards Father Crichton, who was returning (*re infecta*) from his

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 29, 64, 65, 212.

journey to Madrid, whither he had gone, as we have seen, to get Philip to embrace the Enterprize.

*Aquaviva to Provincial of France, Rome, December 5, 1583.* "I do not think it well that Crichton should go to Paris. The King of France has shown that he suspects that our Fathers are taking part in matters of State. I do not wish him to be confirmed in that idea. Some people would interpret the Father's coming, and his transactions with the Ambassador of Scotland and others which he could not avoid, in an adverse sense, and this would not be at all for the good of the Society." He is therefore to stop at Chambery.

This letter brings before us the growing difficulty in France where Catholics were dividing; some (the majority) siding with the Guises, others rallying to the King. The Jesuits themselves were split into parties, Claude Matthieu siding warmly with the former, Edmond Auger with the latter. The General himself was in the greatest difficulties with the Popes and Princes. They desired that the Jesuits should take leading places in the religious agitation, while Aquaviva, much as he sympathized with their cause, was well aware of the many evil consequences which would befall his men, if they did so engage themselves. Some of them, however, were not to be restrained, and Father Henri Samerie, who had once been chaplain to Mary Queen of Scots, may be specially mentioned here. When his intercepted letters, written under the name of De la Rue, are compared with those of Father Persons, we perceive that the latter may, by comparison, be considered a moderate man, especially when we remember the religious ferment with which Europe was then seething. It is necessary to take into consideration the careers of men like Father Samerie, and the Scotch convert, Dr. John Hamilton, and political publications such as those of Dr. William Reynolds, professor at the English College, Douay, before we can form an adequate judgment on the actions and writings of the English Jesuit.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the career of Hamilton see T. G. Law, *Catholic Tractates*. (Scottish Text Society, 1902.) Reynold's *De auctoritate Reipublice Christiane in Reges hereticos* was published at Antwerp in 1592. *Leicester's Commonwealth* was ascribed by some Protestant contemporaries to Persons, but it is now generally held that he was not its author. His name may have been originally connected with it, through the seizure of some copies upon the Jesuit Lay-brother, Ralph Emerson, who was Persons' agent for conveying books to England. Strype, *Annals*, iv., p. 258. Father Samerie's intercepted letters are in the Record Office. Some of them are published in Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, iii. pp. 342, 348.

The following letters refer to the conduct of the English Jesuit mission.

*Aquaviva to Persons, Rome, 3 July, 1584.* We desired the recall of Father Holt because we believed that King James desired it. Consult with the Archbishop of Glasgow, Lord Seton, and Father Claude Matthieu, as to whether it would be preferable for him to remain. Before sending a fresh missionary consult Allen as well as the above, and obtain the blessing of the Papal Nuncio, in case there is not time to write and ask for that of the Pope. "The chief point to be considered in sending a missionary is whether it would please the King," or create new difficulties for him.

We have heard say that the zeal of our missionaries in England increases the persecution. Consult this point with Allen, and report on the probabilities of our men working safely, and with fruit to souls. To send missionaries in order to give edification by their patience under torture, might injure many Catholics and do no good to souls. [*Abstract. The original fills one and a half pages.*]

*Same to the Same, Rome, 15 July, 1584.* We have spoken to the Pope about the desire of Dr. Allen and the English Catholics. He gives his blessing to the mission, and Father Weston may now go to England. His Holiness finds a difficulty about the Scottish mission. It seems to irritate the ministers against the King. If, however, the Archbishop of Glasgow, Lord Seton, Dr. Allen, and our Fathers desire it, you may act for the best. [*Abstract. 1 page.*]

*Same to Same, Rome, 29 July, 1584.* You are not to go to Scotland, both because of your duties in Paris, and because it would arouse rumours which might injure the King and the Catholics. [*Abstract.*]

*Same to French Provincial, Rome, 15 December, 1584.* Father Tyrie had better not go to Scotland. His writings have exposed him (it is said) to the attacks of the ministers.

*Same to the Archbishop of Glasgow (at Paris), Rome, 1 January, 1585.* The sending of missionaries was intermitted until we heard from Father Gordon [who had reached Scotland in the previous August], and lest their inopportune arrival should cause new difficulties to the King, &c. In consequence of what you now write, I am ordering the Provincial in Paris to send Father Hay, &c. "If ever we hold back, you may be sure that the reason is that we are either unable to help, or that we know others would do the work better, or that the business is such that for its own sake, it should be treated by others" (*in bonum ipsorum negotiorum cedere quod per alios tractarentur*).<sup>1</sup>

To return to Allen and Persons. In January, 1585, the Father General had called Persons from Paris to Rome, though for various reasons he did not leave France till September, when

<sup>1</sup> The above extracts are taken from the Registers of the General's letters to France for 1584, at folios 53, 55, 56, 64, 65. The letters are in Italian and Latin.

he came to the Eternal City in company with Allen. It would take some time to describe the changes that had taken place there since the succession of Pope Sixtus V., but for our present purposes this will not be necessary. Baron von Hübner has already done justice to the statesman-like policy followed by Sixtus towards Elizabeth. Here as everywhere he was original and firm. Allen and Persons, it seems, had less influence with him than with his more paternal predecessor. Sixtus was naturally inclined to great measures, and the idea of "occupying" Elizabeth with war in Ireland, would not have appealed to him, so much as that of a great Armada. Let war be made on a scale adequate to the end in view, and he was prepared to grant great subsidies. But he would not pay until the invasion really began, and consequently he never paid at all. It sounds at first like sharp practice, but it was really a part of a high and definite policy. It saved him, for instance, from the mortification of renewing in vain the excommunication of Elizabeth.<sup>1</sup>

But though Allen and Persons had now perhaps less influence than ever on the progress of the great duel between Spain and England, it cannot be maintained that they were more in sympathy with their country than before. It is unfortunate that we know hardly anything about them at this time, except what we gather from the dispatches of the Spanish Ambassador, Olivares,<sup>2</sup> and what he wrote is not always pleasant reading for Englishmen. How much of this is due to Olivares, I do not pretend to determine, but it would seem that the further these clergymen travelled from England (it was only persecution which had driven them away), the less their power, if I may use the metaphor, of feeling the pulse of the Catholics at home.

But at least it cannot be said that Allen made any pretence of disguising his opinion that Philip was justified in his quarrel with Elizabeth. He maintained it publicly in his *Letter concerning the yielding up of the City of Daventry unto his Catholic Majesty by Sir William Stanley, Knight*.

Both the act which is here defended, and the style of the defence made, were characteristic of the lengths to which men, otherwise moderate, were carried during those terrible years

<sup>1</sup> I did not find any indication at the Vatican of its renewal, and I think Lingard (vi. 508) must be mistaken in the interpretation which he puts upon Spondanus, who may only be speaking of *preparations* for an excommunication. (*Annales*, § 1588.)

<sup>2</sup> They are printed both in Spanish and English in Father Knox's *Letters of Cardinal Allen*. Hume's *Spanish Calendar*, 1587-1603, has a somewhat larger selection, but not so well edited.



of persecution, deceit and war. In 1586 the Earl of Leicester had induced the town of Deventer in Flanders to revolt from the Spanish King and had garrisoned it with troops, who were mostly English or Irish Catholics, under the command of Sir William Stanley. Elizabeth left her troops unpaid and unfed, so that desertion and insubordination were in the air, and of this circumstance the Prince of Parma took advantage in order to induce Stanley, not only to surrender the town, but to come over with the garrison to the ranks of the Spanish army. Such a proceeding, however repugnant to our sense of honour and patriotism, could, in fact, be defended on paper—it might be said that Elizabeth had abandoned Stanley, and that there was nothing in theory to prevent his entering Philip's service, seeing that there had been no declaration of war between the two countries; while the town of Deventer certainly belonged to Spain. Allen, with Persons' assistance, put out the above-named book, which maintained this thesis, and even declared that all Catholics in Stanley's position were bound to act as he did, under pain of mortal sin. This conclusion was at variance with the directions laid down by the Father General Aquaviva, 15th December, 1582, for the Jesuit confessors in France, at the time of Anjou's attack on the Netherlands. The Fathers were forbidden to offer decisions as to the justice of the quarrel, or to refuse absolution to those who conscientiously believed that their prince was in the right. Confessors would have been bound to do this if the conclusions of Allen's pamphlet were to be upheld. An answer to Allen was written by a Catholic; and Father Christopher Grene, who transcribed it from the original, believed that the author was an English Jesuit.<sup>1</sup> Though the latter statement seems somewhat uncertain (so far, at least, as internal evidence is concerned) the letter evidently points to the presence among the rank and file of the English Catholics of a state of feeling very different from that of Allen and Persons, in regard to the main end towards which their policy was directed.<sup>2</sup>

If we regard the action of Allen and Persons attentively

<sup>1</sup> Knox, *Letters of Allen*, p. 299.

<sup>2</sup> This argument might be urged too far. Gilbert Gifford, the hateful traitor who betrayed Mary Queen of Scots, claimed to have written *an* answer to Allen, and it *may* be that he wrote this, affecting the moderation of a genuine good Catholic. The conclusion as stated in the text, however, will retain its force even in this hypothesis, though after all the presumption is that Father Grene's statement was right, and that there were several answers to the pamphlet.

during these years, we see that they have little, if any, influence on the circumstances which led to the sailing of the Armada. It can hardly cause astonishment that they should regard its success as an evil less great than that under which they were actually labouring. We cannot indeed but feel that in their correspondence with the Spanish officials they spoke in too complacent a tone of a war which was to be waged against their own kith and kin. On the other hand, we must remember that the inner significance of their words did not escape the men whom they addressed. "They are schooled," said Olivares, "by that potent mistress, Necessity—*Necessidad gran maestra*." The excuse, which these words imply, may be well extended to the whole of their politics. Without justifying, it at least explains how they took, without assisting, the Spanish side.

Of Allen's *Admonition to the Nobility and People of England*, it will be sufficient to say here, that it was written to be published in case the Armada were victorious, and both Elizabeth and Protestantism defeated, and that, under these circumstances, he was prepared to say the severest things of Elizabeth and her persecution. When it came to practical politics, however, he ordered the tract not to be published, but burnt. Its value, therefore, as evidence of the course which Catholics actually followed, needs many qualifications, more than can be discussed in this summary view of what Catholics really did at this crisis.<sup>1</sup>

If, as seems most probable, the influence even of the most respected Catholic exiles had no appreciable effect upon the conduct of Philip at this juncture, it is easy to see that the exiles of lesser note, such as the Lords Westmorland and Paget, Charles Arundel, Charles Paget and Thomas Morgan will have had none whatever. As a body, however, they seem to have desired the success of the Spanish arms, and some accepted commissions in the Spanish army. Of Thomas Morgan I find it on record, that when in prison in Paris and expecting death, he begged his mistress, Mary Stuart, to have two Masses said for him daily at St. Paul's in perpetuity.<sup>2</sup> The sentiment that England would soon return to the faith of its fathers, which this request so clearly illustrates, seemed ineradicable in the

<sup>1</sup> The tract itself has been reprinted by Mendham and others. A full description and discussion of it from a Catholic point of view will be found in an appendix to Lingard's *History of England*, vi. p. 706; and in C. Butler's *Memoirs of English Catholics*.

<sup>2</sup> Murdin, *State Papers*, p. 444.

minds of the English Catholics. It was really of great assistance to Elizabeth. While they trusted to fate, her ministers acted vigorously, even violently, and with results not difficult to foresee.

Deprived as the Catholics at home were of all liberty of speech, it is very difficult to gain any sort of definite information about them, and harder still to ascertain their inner thoughts. We know very little even about their numbers. No census even of the roughest sort was ever taken, and we have to be content with vague statements on the part of friends, that they are "infinite," "very many," "more than any one would think." Alarmist Protestants use terms which are still more ample, vague, and unsatisfactory. There is a general consensus that the Catholics were in a considerable majority in the North. They did not, however, reach the majority throughout the whole country, unless "discontents" are reckoned in with them. So says the somewhat careful plan for the "Enterprise" elaborated in 1583,<sup>1</sup> which substantially agrees with Dr. Allen's complimentary way of putting the matter at the time of the accession of Pope Sixtus V., whom he congratulated (May 17, 1585), "in the name of the larger and sounder part of our nation." (*Majoris et sanioris nostræ gentis nomine*).<sup>2</sup>

In the "discourse" said to have been found upon Crichton, the number of Catholics was estimated at two-thirds of the population. This estimate has been somewhat widely accepted, but it appears to me that the authority on which it comes to us is certainly inferior to that of the papers just mentioned, and that the presumption is, that the Catholic population had fallen to a half the whole, before the Armada sailed. This conclusion, as to the equal division of England between Catholics and Protestants, may be strengthened by a passing comparison with the similar state of parties in Scotland. Archibald Douglas, writing officially to Walsingham, November 17, 1587, uses the following terms:

The Protestants consist of a few members of the nobility, and of the meanest sort of gentlemen, called Lairdis, whose second sons and brethren are, for the most part, become merchants and travellers by sea, and of the great body of merchants dwelling in the towns. . . . A Prince grieved in mind, a number of nobility, almost equally divided

<sup>1</sup> Knox, *Allen's Letters*, p. liv.

<sup>2</sup> Vatican Archives. *Let. di Vescovi*, ii. 366. This letter is not in Knox's *Letters of Cardinal Allen*.

anent their religion into Protestant and Papist, with a number of indifferent religion, that did sometimes profess their obedience to the authority of the Queen, the King's mother, and which now, being joined to the Papists for the better furtherance of their intended matter, make that party both greater in number of nobility and stronger in force. . . . The King doth yet remain indifferent to both parties.<sup>1</sup>

It will assist us to judge of the feelings of the Catholics towards Elizabeth, if we make our inquiry cover the question of her sentiments towards them. It was said, when Elizabeth came to the throne, that the religious profession which she really loved best, was that in which she was born, *i.e.*, that professed by her father during his latter years, a schism in which as many Catholic doctrines as possible were to be preserved, while the Crown was to hold the Primacy, instead of the Pope. But she could do nothing without the services of Edward's ministers and of the extreme reformers, and to them, in most things, she accordingly submitted. Whatever foundation in fact these views may have, the English Catholics were convinced that their troubles at least were primarily due not to her, but to the Puritans. Elizabeth really desired to rule with praise for gentleness. But then she also claimed the right of legislating in ecclesiastical matters and of exacting obedience by force. Her fallacious assurances, therefore, could bring no practical comfort to her Catholic subjects, though she herself was deceived by them. It was mendacity, rather than cruelty, which was the predominant fault of Elizabeth's character and of her reign. The following extracts from dispatches of the French Ambassador, illustrate the strange position of the English Queen towards her subjects. They must be accepted with qualifications, for they commence in 1579, during the period of Anjou's courtship, when the French took a roseate view of all things English, and when Elizabeth described herself as *une bonne françoise*.

Your good sister, the Queen [so the King of France was told, May 27, 1579], gives secretly much favour and assistance to the Catholics, and shuts her eyes and ears to all the bad reports made to her about them. [The Protestants] fear that, if she marries a Catholic Prince like your brother the Duke, she will rely more upon that [*i.e.*, the Catholic] side than on the other.

On the 30th of August, 1580, the same Ambassador, Castelnau de Mauvissière writes again :

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of Hatfield Papers*, iii. p. 295, extract.

The Queen does not wish to force the consciences [of the Catholics], but that they should live according to the laws and institutions made since she has been Queen. In fine, the said Queen, who is naturally inclined to desire all friendship to the said Catholics, recognizes that they are also her best subjects.

On the 6th of November he says that she has spoken *honorablement* of the Pope in the matter of the invasion of Ireland. What he means is, that she was far less rude than he anticipated she would be, saying "she wished no harm to the *pauvre bon homme, qui estoit si liberal de donner les royaumes qui n'estoient pas en sa puissance*," for she knew that he only acted at the instigation of the King of Spain. On the 9th of April, 1581, he says that the Irish *et plusieurs Angloys* are very devoted to the Catholic religion. "And they always hope that their Queen bears them more affection than she shows through her laws, and the police of her kingdom,"—the passionate Puritans indeed fear that if she marries a Catholic, she will favour the Catholic party, "but they place their only hope in God, who never abandons His own." On the 20th of July, 1582, he mentions the terrible persecutions of the Catholics, who nevertheless continue to increase in numbers. "*Les pauvres Catholiques se fient plus à Dieu, que aux rois et princes de la terre ; s'ils avoient ung chef, ils remouroient bien du mesnage*" (i.e., there would soon be disturbances).<sup>1</sup>

As the date of the last dispatch was that at which plans for the conquest of England were being discussed abroad ; it may be well to refer to two correspondents of Walsingham, who write to him on the same subject in September, 1582. William Williams, one of his spies on the English Catholics, informed him that after much inquiry he could not detect the presence in England of any plans of rebellion, while the Earl of Leicester wrote, that Elizabeth was slow to believe that the great increase of Papists is a danger to her realm, and adds, "The Lord of his mercy open her eyes!"<sup>2</sup>

Without attempting to explain here the diversity of form and expression which these witnesses use, they all seem to agree with one part or other of this proposition,—that considering the numbers and the sufferings of the English Catholics, anyone would have expected to find them plotting, but that in fact they are not doing so. The Spanish Ambassador, Mendoza,

<sup>1</sup> R.O. Bashel's Transcripts.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, p. 69.

affirmed what comes to much the same thing, when he wrote, 9 February, 1582, that without foreign assistance the English Catholics would not rise against their government.

According to the "Discourse" on the invasion of England, made abroad in 1583 and found upon Crichton in 1584, the reason for believing that the English Catholics would join the invaders was that they were suffering an unbearable persecution. But Mendoza living in England sees the matter in a different light. In March, 1583, he describes the Catholics as paralyzed with fear, though their courageous adherence to their faith does not grow weaker, and, strange to say, numbers of converts continue to join them. On the 6th of May he reports that there are no leagues amongst the English Catholic gentry or associations for self-defence, no common plans for throwing off the Protestant yoke. They are so terrified by persecution that they avoid all expression of opinion on the subject. Nevertheless he felt sure that they would call for the King of Spain (whether as ruler or as umpire is not stated), if, upon the death of Elizabeth, a strong Spanish army were to appear on the coast. On the 9th of July following he develops this idea, the Queen of Scots was to be put upon the throne, under Spanish rather than French protection. He has "no knowledge of any principal Catholic here being in treaty with Guise." In November when the arrests because of Somerville and Throckmorton were being made, he found the English Catholics "quite cowed." In September, 1585, information reached him that there was a terror among the Catholics, who quite wished to be exiled, or to give security for their good behaviour.<sup>1</sup>

Most highly should we prize any definite information about the English Catholics during the critical years 1586, 1587, 1588, but we unfortunately know little or nothing relating to that time. In January, 1587, occurred the surrender of Sir William Stanley with his garrison at Deventer, which has been already referred to. This however must surely be taken as an index of the feeling towards Elizabeth, into which Englishmen easily passed when abroad, not as a sign that Catholics at home were already preparing themselves for a similar change of side. That they were not so occupied, is easily seen from the reports on the state of England gathered by the Spaniards before the sailing of the Armada. Preparations of such a kind would have been mentioned there in the first place had they

<sup>1</sup> *Spanish Calendar* 1580—1586, pp. 293, 457, 461, 467, 492, 547.

existed ; but we read of nothing of the sort. We find in these papers nothing but vague guesses at the possible number of allies, the estimates being lowest, when they descend to particular names and numbers. A Scotchman, called James Stuart, is the most precise, and he was of opinion that Northumberland and Westmorland might join with a good part of Lancashire, and some dozens of squires from Yorkshire and Norfolk, but even he tells us nothing about the reasons on which he bases his information. In April, 1587, a Spanish sailor reports that he had heard that "great numbers" of English would take the Spaniards' side. At the same time Mendoza forwarded a report from an unnamed correspondent, in which a round number is given of the possible friends in each county.<sup>1</sup> There is good reason for doubting the reliability of this document, for Walsingham was at the time actively employed in trying to mislead Mendoza by supplying him with false news. But even if we waive the point of good faith, and give the statement its highest possible value, it only amounts to a renewal of the old vague statements that a considerable proportion of the English would *in the future* favour Spanish intervention, it says nothing of the *actual* preparedness of the Catholics to co-operate with their foreign friends. A letter from Father Persons to the Spanish Secretary, Don John Idiaquez, shows us that the Spaniards on their side did not endeavour to arrive at an understanding with their co-religionists in England.

At the time of the Armada [he says], no account was made of [our English party] nor was any confidence placed in any living person of the nation either within or without the realm. This was deeply felt by all good men.<sup>2</sup>

When the Armada was expected, the Catholic prisoners throughout the country were examined as to their allegiance under oath, and the overwhelming majority professed themselves ready to fight for the Queen. As these prisoners comprised the firmest and most constant of the Catholic body, this oath must certainly be considered as an important manifestation of opinion. But again the issues were confused by the persecuting zeal of the Protestants. They asked whether the prisoners would fight against the Pope, not whether they would resist the Spaniard. Under such circumstances the affirmative

<sup>1</sup> *Spanish Calendar 1580—1586*, p. 610; 1587—1603, pp. 184, 265.

<sup>2</sup> Knox, *Letters of Cardinal Allen*, p. cxiv.



answers should probably be applied to the Spaniards in an *a fortiori* sense, while the refusals do not necessarily hold, except according to the letter of the oath.

The tradition is doubtless true, that the English Catholics ranged themselves with zeal among the troops assembled to resist the Armada, but too much has been made of the loyalty of such courtiers as Lord Howard of Effingham, the Lord Admiral, whose Catholicity was either a secret, or a family tradition only. We are on safer ground, when we rely upon a dispatch of the Venetian Ambassador in Paris who says, in 1602, "I am told that when Spain attacked England the last time that all the Catholics remained loyal to the Queen." An even stronger testimony, because it comes from a decided advocate of Spain, is that of Sir Francis Englefield, who wrote on the third of February, 1589, only a few months after the defeat of the Armada, that it seemed there was no immediate hope for the reconversion of England, because the English Catholics themselves "are resolved to resist Spain."<sup>1</sup>

The evidence, which has been brought to show what the endeavours and aspirations of the English Catholics were during the crisis of the war of England and Spain, are too vague and scanty, it must be confessed, to allow us to base upon them any definite or elaborate statements, except those of a negative character. Yet on one point do they appear conclusive. Placed in a position of the greatest difficulty, in which simple and entire loyalty to the Government was impossible, the Catholics of England, during all this crisis, did not entertain so much as the first notions of rebellion.

J. H. POLLEN.

<sup>1</sup> *Venetian Calendar, 1581—1602; Domestic Calendar, Addenda 1580—1625, p. 297.*

## *Principles of Western Civilization.*<sup>1</sup>

---

So far as Mr. Kidd's undoubtedly remarkable book is an apology for religion and even for Christianity, it is also unfortunately, a dangerous attack on all that is popularly understood by Catholicism ; since it regards the Reformation as one of the most important and necessary steps in the evolution of modernism. If Mr. Kidd is right, we are certainly wrong—and it is far better to be clear on this point, and not to yield to the fascination of a theory which is not less fatal to our position because it is put forward in defence of much that we hold by. *Non tali auxilio* must be our answer to those who offer us such weapons of defence.

In his former work, *Social Evolution*, Mr. Kidd insisted on the need of ultra-rational, or as we should say, super-natural, sanctions for that altruism for which rationalism can offer no solid motive, and without which there can be no barrier against the socially disastrous effects of every kind of "restriction" by which the egoism of the dominant classes or nations seeks the advantage of the present and particular, at the sacrifice of the future and universal. There, as in this volume, he pointed out that the *laissez-faire* tactics of Manchester Liberalism, though devised to deliver the many from the selfishness of the few, offered no safeguard against the selfishness of the many ; that a free fight was not necessarily a fair fight ; that the victors in turn would reinstitute the old tyrannical and artificial inequality. In the universal interests of social evolution, as distinct from the interests of any state or nation, equality of *external* opportunities is the condition by which alone the fullest benefit can be reaped from those mental and moral energies which constitute the real wealth of the race. Although minimizing, Mr. Kidd does not deny inherent inequalities between man and man. The ideal society is that in which men are ranked according to these

<sup>1</sup> *Principles of Western Civilization.* By Benjamin Kidd. London : Macmillan, 1902.

and not according to some artificial scale. Hence it will aim at giving every man a chance of bringing out the best that is in him, and at burying as few talents as possible. But this can only be, so far as society is shaped by those who have the universal interest at heart and not that of their own class or nation; who are dominated by a sentiment for which rationalism offers no justification; but which religion, *i.e.*, Christianity, justifies. In this volume he tells us that the future of our civilization rests with those who are faithful to the principle that had shaped it so far, albeit unconsciously—the principle of sacrifice which subjects the interest of the particular to the universal, of the present to the future. This law of the Gospel, he tells us, is also the law of biological evolution; though Darwin has failed to recognize its full import. Even Huxley, in his Romanes lecture, was so belated as to oppose the moral instinct (ultimately, the instinct of self-sacrifice and altruism) to the biological instinct, not aware of more recent observation which has established that those types necessarily survive in which the instinct of sacrifice is strongest—not of inane and purposeless sacrifice, but of sacrifice in the interests of posterity. Even the self-care of the present generation is, in the intention of nature, subordinate to the interests of that ever-expanding multitude in the future, compared with which the past and present is a numerically inappreciable, though morally responsible, minority. “What has posterity done for me?” is a most “reasonable” question; but it is opposed to a sentiment which is at the very root of all human evolution. The attempt of utilitarians like J. S. Mill to analyze this social sentiment into egoistic elements, is not only scientifically unreal, but belongs to a philosophy that must at last return to its starting-point. The selfish quest of self can never lead to the general good, but only to self-advantage, and that of a limited kind. Nor is the result different if we take some higher unit like the State or Nation, which by a sort of practical abstraction treats itself apart from the rest of humanity of which it is really but a very subordinate part. The error which Christianity has been slowly trying to formulate and condemn these two thousand years is that which leads each generation to look on itself as the final fruit of the whole process of previous human history, and to forget that infinite future which shall spring from its own loins, whose claim against its own is as the claim of a whole nation against a single individual, or even more absolute. This is the

very error with which Liberalism justly charges past generations who have forged fetters for us from which it would strike us free. They have lived each fronting the past and with its back to the future; but Christianity has at last taught us to turn round and seek the universal all-ruling interest in what is coming, not in what has been and is gone. To the rationalist, the entrusting of the fate of humanity to Adam seems iniquitous, judged by the law of egoism; but, according to Mr. Kidd's doctrine, each generation is the Adam of an infinite posterity and enters into a like responsibility; and the nation or institution that exploits posterity to its own present gain shall surely die. The future therefore is with those who understand their duty and do it; others, as less fit, will be naturally eliminated. The all-importance of the Present—of *nos qui vivimus*—is the common assumption of the Social Democrat and of the Conservative; of Karl Marx and of Nietzsche. Towards the irrevocable past we have little or no duty; we are, however, all-conscious of its neglected duties in regard to ourselves, and all-unconscious of the like duties we owe to those coming after us. It is thought much if religion and morality will take a man out of himself so far as to make him die or live for those around him; but the conception of a higher unity, to which the whole existing present is subordinate, has been so far ill-defined and feebly operative.

Turning to the history of our civilization, Mr. Kidd shows that those who have fought the battles of liberty have, as a rule, been instinctively right in what they opposed, but have erred in the rational formulation of their principle and have embodied it in institutions vitiated by some sort of absolutism and finality. They have condemned the past for its relative narrowness and have themselves fallen into the same pit. Their sentiment was wider and greater than their reason; and indeed these false formulations have often retarded the development of the sentiment and led to its periodic obscurity.

To serve others we must first make ourselves strong and capable; and so the race that is to survive and triumph as most serviceable to the vast future, must likewise be strong and capable, *i.e.*, we have two clearly separated epochs of social evolution; first, one which tends to secure supreme military efficiency through the subjection of the individual to the State; and then that in which some military efficient race will be selected by

the elimination of those races which sacrifice the future to the present to a greater degree.

To the first epoch belongs the idea of the State as a development of the family and as bound together by the incommunicable tie of consanguinity. Here religion takes the congenial form of ancestor-worship; the deity is the parent of the tribe, shares all its sentiments of exclusiveness, sanctions all its customs, and gives a divine character to the civil or tribal laws. He fights with and for his people, and promises them an universal empire in which all other peoples shall be the slaves of their pleasure and convenience. The carnal Messianic ideas against which Christ contended at the cost of His life, were somewhat of this class; that it was not in being served by humanity, but in serving humanity that Israel was to realize the old-world prophecies of its supremacy, was the main theme of His teaching concerning the Kingdom of God. All the old-world religions whose gods were the fathers and founders of the tribe, were of this narrow, exclusive, strictly *national* type. The god's whole interest was in the temporal pre-eminence of his own *nati* over all other nations, and the distinction between civil and divine law was meaningless. The rights of blood were everything, the rights of personality nothing. In the history of the Roman people we see this conception of society culminate, decline, and fall to pieces. Emperor-worship was equivalently the worship of Force as the ultimate foundation of right; the acknowledgment of the sovereign and absolute claims of the present against the future; the denial of all rights to the unborn. The gradual extension of the theoretically inalienable rights of citizenship to non-citizens, due partly to the unworkableness of the idea of one all-dominating family, partly to the natural decay of the family feeling of exclusiveness according as the limits of the family vanish from distinct consciousness, issued at last in the act by which Justinian abolished all practical difference between the *Jus Civile* and the *Jus Gentium*. But this semblance of a more catholic feeling sprang from no catholic principle—from no sentiment of the rights of personality; but only from a weakening of the tribal instinct under the excessive burden laid upon it; from the indifferentism to public interests which marks an age of decadence. Nursed in the bosom of the later Hebrew prophets, the true principle of social evolution was first enunciated by the life and teaching of Christ—the principle of self-sacrifice in the general interest,

of the subjection of the present to the future, of the one to the many, of the part to the whole. The history of Christianity is that of the conflict of this heaven with the resisting mass of pagandom into which it was thrust, and which, according to Mr. Kidd, it has barely yet permeated.

The infinite and absolute value of the individual, as revealed by Christ, makes his wholesale subjection to the convenience of another individual or of the State an intolerable notion; it forbids not merely every sort of murder but every sort of "restriction" that would in any way curtail the spiritual development of one man in the interests of another; it demands the greatest possible equality of external opportunity for all; and therefore will not tolerate the exploitation of the future in the interests of the present. Yet it is a principle given us rather by sentiment than by reason—one of Pascal's "reasons of the heart;" it is a fact of that underlying will-world which it is the hopeless task of reason to formulate adequately in its own restricted symbolism. And for this reason, though it has been operative of all true social evolution in the modern era, it has been felt rather than known, and has often been more obscured than explained by the creeds and institutions in which men have sought to embody it. The old pagan categories still dominate our thought, and we strive to encase the spirit of Christian liberty in the political conceptions of Aristotle—conceptions shaped by a belief in the paramount ascendancy of the Present. The crowning of Charlemagne by the Pope meant the conclusive triumph of the spiritual or universal over the material or particular conception of political ends; but the catholic spirit was still imprisoned in a pagan mould. The subsequent conflict between Pope and Emperor for the supremacy over the nations could have only one logical issue, namely, the theocracy of the mediæval Papacy. On his own admissions the Emperor had no case—no right in the sanctuary.

But in this theocracy, says Mr. Kidd, we have simply the machinery of the old order applied to the ends and purposes of the new; we have once more the identification of the rule of religion with the rule of law; albeit of a law that now looks beyond the present and particular to the future and universal. Heresy is law-breaking, and persecution or intolerance is a logical and rational necessity. While going with the Papacy in what it denied as against every form of Erastianism that would subject the temporal to the universal, Mr. Kidd finds in what it

asserted as the alternative the same absolutism in another form, all the more deadly because applied to spiritual things and backed-up by spiritual sanctions—in fact, the deadliest absolutism the mind of man has ever conceived—an attempt to limit the spiritual beliefs and sentiments, not only of the present but of the future, by those of the immovable past ; to call a sudden halt in the onward march of the human soul towards an ever fuller Christianity. Against this absolutism he sees an irreligious reaction towards pseudo-liberty in the Renaissance with its pagan sympathies, and its desire to liberate the present not merely from the shackles of the past, but from all responsibility towards the future. In the Reformation he sees a religious reaction blundering along in its efforts to understand itself and falling time after time into forms of theocracy even less desirable, because less catholic, than that of the Papacy ; and finding its true expression at last in so comparatively simple an event as the Virginian Declaration of Rights,<sup>1</sup> in which tolerance for everything but intolerance is recognized not as a political expedient, but as a religious duty founded on the inviolable sacredness of human personality. This, according to Mr. Kidd, is identical with that equality of external opportunity for all, which sets free men's energies and secures the ultimate prevalence of what is best and the elimination of what is less good. The future is with those nations which are most deeply possessed by this sentiment of liberty, provided they be also physically strong enough to hold their own against those of a lower moral type. He means, with England and America, as opposed to the Latin nations, whose whole language, inner and outer, is saturated with the absolutism of their mother Rome ; and to whom, therefore, the ascendancy of the Present is as axiomatic, as its subjection to the immeasurably more-to-be-considered Future is paradoxical. For these the alternative is Paganism or Papacy, *i.e.*, liberalism (in the utilitarian sense) or absolutism ; but of liberty they have no glimmer.

Such in very brief outline, is the position taken up by Mr. Kidd—a strong plea for religion ; for super-rational sanctions ; for a recognition of those will-values which are the very main-springs of social life, and of which tyrannical rationalism can make no account. How far he mis-reads the mind of the Catholic Church and paints it in colours proper to the petrified Churches of the East, with their backs turned to the future and

<sup>1</sup> June 12, 1776.



their eyes fixed on the past, will not be hard to see for those who have eyes. It was she, he admits, who crushed heresy after heresy, with an unerring instinct, detecting in each the denial of that catholicism and universality which is the breath of her nostrils. Time after time she has shown herself greater and wider than the greatest and widest of her exponents, and has burst asunder the bonds in which ill-judged zeal for her welfare has fettered her liberty. To put one very pertinent question, which ought to make Mr. Kidd reconsider what he has said with regard to the Papacy: Whence comes now the only firm and authoritative protest against that socially fatal restriction which exploits the future in the selfish interests of the present, and which spreads like a devouring pestilence, not only in Latinized France, but also in Protestant America and England? Does it come from America, or from England, or from the successor of Hildebrand?

G. TYRRELL.

## *Epipsychidion.*

---

### PART OF A DIARY.

---

November 26th.

THROUGH the chilly air fell withered leaves—the wind sighed and moaned—and seemed in a way to soothe the poet's troubled heart. . . .

How long was it since he had stood at his unlighted window watching, waiting for the return of the woman he loved?

Vague forms passed up and down the sombre, night-shadowed street—more wildly still the wind wailed and shrieked, as it rushed through some open gateway, what was human sorrow to its sorrow it seemed to cry, and still with tired, burning eyes straining through the darkness the poet waited—waited. Then a terrible fear suddenly took possession of his whole being—an awful presage of evil—and long before the night was over all hope had left him. . . .

He had loved her as no woman had ever been loved before—had given her his whole heart—and now she had left him for ever—left him, although she was even now standing before him in the pallid light of morning. . . .

A few hours before glowing with life and beauty, she was now but a poor, pale ghost—a shadow—a thing wholly of the past. Why had she risen from her tomb?

That poem of Alfred de Musset's haunts me—I wish I had never happened to read it! What if Michael should ever come to have that feeling about me—that awful feeling of everything being over—finished. . . .

November 30th.

"Ianthé, dear child, you will think I am for ever harping on these subjects, but, sometimes, I try to look at things from your point of view, and then I am filled with dismay—almost terror.

"To me the thought of living in a world that is only

controlled and directed by a blind, unfeeling, unseeing power—a world that is no better than a great self-propelled machine, is perfectly awful. . . .

"You do not see it in this way ; so far the world has been very friendly to you, you have lived in the sunshine, like a butterfly, and managed to creep away from all the storms of life into some little hiding-place of your own. . . .

"But, indeed, Ianthe, when you come to know more of life you will see that there are things which would be unendurable—would drive one half-mad with sorrow and shame—if it were not for the consciousness that divine Love is ever with us—divine Justice over-ruling all things for the best—that nothing happens by chance.

"The thought of this came home to me so strongly only last night. I was sitting up with a poor young fellow who was dying of rapid consumption. We had once worked together in a French studio and I knew him to be full of genius. Then he had been most shamefully treated by his own people, literally done to death, and if he and I had looked on death as those that have no hope, there would have been nothing but misery and rebellion in our hearts.

"As it was my friend had not a single thought of bitterness. . . . 'Forgetting those things which were behind, and reaching forth into those things which are before,' we inquired between ourselves, in the presence of Truth . . . of what nature the eternal life of the saints would be. . . .

"God's love was such a close, living reality to him, he was so certain this love was with him every moment, that there was no room for fear or doubt. . . . At daybreak he said he should like to see the priest who prepared him for his first Communion—and, after having made his last Communion, he passed away very peacefully and happily. . . . But I will not go on with this, his death affected me very deeply, and yet I would not recall him for the world.

"Ianthe, cannot you see the difference between a Christian's death and the death of one who has no outlook at all—or only believes he will become part of the forces of nature? Death is a fact we all must face, Ianthe." . . .

December 2nd.

Yesterday I looked up Michael's old book and read two passages he had underlined.

"They, O Lord, that love visible things love not the

invisible, and they that follow external vanities, they forsake the inward riches. Thou and the earth, O Lord, cannot be loved together, for earthly love blindeth the eyes of the soul that she cannot see the excellency of Thy holy love." . . .

"Tell me, therefore, my soul, and answer me, O thou wretched creature, and show me what is the cause, for which thou runnest so willingly hungry and thirsty after creatures, so shamefully begging of them a little drop of muddy, unsavoury, and brackish water, which rather augmenteth than slaketh thy thirst, and leaveth the clear, sweet, and perpetual fountain of all good, in which thou mayest quench thy heat and satisfy thyself to thy own will and liking?"

December 4th.

I have written to Michael saying just what is in my mind—I wanted to tell him how perfectly miserable it makes me to be shut outside that wonderful supernatural world of his—how I hate all my miserable limitations—how I don't want to be frivolous, worldly, materialistic. . . .

December 10th.

Michael answered by return of post—his letter was just like himself—so wonderfully sympathetic . . . he seems to feel everything with me, and I am quite happy again. In a few weeks, he says, he will be with us, dear, dearest Michael!

"I needn't tell you, Ianthe, that I pray for you every day—pray for you with all my heart, and, listen Ianthe, just as soon as you feel it is possible will you go to the little church on the moors—the "House where God lives," and pray for me, then we shall meet in our prayers even before we really meet—and where we felt most separated, we shall be most closely joined together." . . .

Those last words of his letter keep coming back to me. . . .

December 20th.

Two days more and Michael will be with us, we had a post-card from London this morning. . . . Ah, me, I do feel so happy, it doesn't seem like the winter any longer—somehow I keep expecting to see the hedges budding out—to hear the larks singing. . . .

December 23rd.

Michael hasn't come. He must have missed his train. I am so disappointed!

January 7th.

Michael, Michael, Michael!

It is a fortnight now since it happened—everything is over, everything, everything! . . .

January 15th.

I think it was Uncle Julian who told me first—and his voice sounded so far away and strange that I couldn't quite understand—then suddenly it all came home to me and I felt as if a cold, heavy hand had been laid on my heart, stopping its beating. . . . Ever since I have felt cold—dead! I cannot cry—I cannot speak out—can only endure—endure!!

Oh, Michael, Michael! . . .

He came by an earlier train—not the one I went to meet—and walked across the moors, it is almost seven miles from the station to our house. . . . Then some boys were trying to slide on the hillside pool, which was only lightly frozen over, and the ice broke and one of the boys fell in. . . . Michael went in after him—had to dive twice—and the second time struck his head. . . .

Michael, Michael, Michael! . . . There wasn't even time for us to say good-bye. . . .

Instead of coming to meet me there you lay, cold and still, silent and unresponsive. . . . It wasn't like you, dearest, not to have one word of comfort—one look of welcome. It wasn't like you, Michael! . . .

Yes, everything is over. Uncle Julian couldn't go to the funeral, but I went, and the little grey, moorland church—Michael's church—looked just the same as it did that Sunday last summer, when we were together, and the same old priest with the quiet, kindly face, read the service. Afterwards he wanted to speak to me, but I hurried away. . . . I couldn't bear to have any one speak to me! All the way home I heard the earth falling on the coffin—saw the grave cut deep in the dark, cold soil—there were no flowers—I wouldn't have any flowers. . . . Michael, Michael, where are you, heart's dearest? You are not here—not here!

January 16th.

I wonder what people mean when they say that love is stronger than death? It is quite untrue. Death kills love just as it kills everything else, and nothing in the whole world is as strong—nothing, nothing! . . . Once I actually thought I should always keep on being happy—that Michael and I

cared so much for one another that somehow nothing could ever really separate us.

How foolish it was of me to think that—how very foolish! It doesn't matter how well and strong people are—how much they are needed—how clever and good they are—in a moment they perish, are taken away for ever. . . . Michael's dead face is always rising up before me—all expression gone, eyes closed, lips silent, . . . a waxen mask, nothing else, . . . and I saw that cold, lifeless image of Michael laid away in the churchyard.—But where is Michael himself? He has been taken away—taken away! All is darkness, silence, mystery! . . .

January 18th.

It is more than I can bear! If only I too could be at an end! I don't want to live any longer—there is nothing to live for. . . . I am afraid of the spring coming—afraid of the summer coming. I'd rather the winter would always stay, . . . always be cold, dark, miserable! . . .

January 19th.

Yesterday the old priest, Father Burton, called. I believe he called once before—wanted especially to see me!

It is impossible for me to see any one—I can just manage to get through my work for Uncle Julian, but that is all. . . .

Oh, if I could die as Michael died—if I only could—if I only could!

January 21st.

This afternoon I went to see the hillside pool.

It wasn't frozen any longer, and the willows at the further end were reflected in the dark, clear waters; suddenly I saw my own face looking back at me in a pale, ghostly way, . . . and for a moment I half expected to see Michael's dead face besides it. . . . The gloomy sky seemed to have drawn very close to the earth—the gathering shadows of twilight to hem me round—to shut me off from all the rest of the world. . . . Then an awful thought came. . . . I wanted to die, and why shouldn't I end up my life just here? Why shouldn't I? why shouldn't I?

How easy it would be to quietly slip into those deep, still waters. There would be a few minutes of pain and struggle, then peace, perfect peace—my long, miserable, restless nights—my still more miserable days—would all be done with for ever—that terrible aching feeling in my heart taken away, . . . no more loneliness, no more unhappiness!

It is impossible to put into words all that has passed through my mind. I only know the temptation grew stronger, more overpowering every minute, that it almost seemed to me as if I were being forced forward by some sympathetic unseen power. . . .

My feet were sinking in the swampy ground that edged the pool, a cold ripple of water flowed over them—one step more and all would have been over with me, but I didn't, couldn't, take that step. . . . There was a sudden rush of new, conflicting feelings. Michael died to save the life of another—but what was I doing?

I don't know how it was, but all in a moment I realized things I had never realized before—the invisible, spiritual things of life. . . . The very pool seemed to be changing before my eyes into an awful fathomless gulf—into the dark, fearful mystery of unending suffering—the remorseless Gehenna of everlasting sorrow and despair. . . . It was all a delusion—that thought of peace and deliverance coming through death, . . . nothing was to be looked for but an eternity of suffering to which my present suffering was nothing at all—a mere drop in the ocean!

Cowardly self-murder. . . . I realized sin and Hell as the struggle went on, . . . and fought, as it were, for liberty with all my strength. . . . And words Michael had spoken came back to me with strange, new force—I almost thought I could hear his voice—and I knew that if there were these awful powers of evil there were also the holy, almighty, powers of good. . . . Over-powering, resistless conviction came, and suddenly I bowed my head and clasped my hands and cried out to God—to Michael's God—the hidden divine Love. . . .

It seems so strange—so impossible—I cannot put it into words—I only know it happened. I only know that with my prayer, if it could be called a prayer, the struggle ended—the passionate wish to end my life was taken away, and that a wonderful feeling of peace and restfulness came—a feeling of hopefulness in the midst of utter despair. . . .

Michael, Michael, Michael!

January 22nd.

All last night I lay awake. . . . Somehow I feel as one feels when there is a sudden lull in a storm, and the wind after battering and beating about you, almost intolerably, suddenly goes down and the night becomes unnaturally quiet and still. You



rest thankfully in this quietness, yet you know that at any moment the storm may begin again. . . .

But my storm can never be the same storm—I am in a new world—everything is different—everything. . . .

January 24th.

. . . "Even so, O Lord and our God, Thou givest Thy holy love to every one of us without exception of persons. The divine Householder is ready to send all into His vineyard, and will deny none the penny of bliss that will labour in it, for the Head of the Church affirmeth that He is not a respecter of persons. He calleth all to the marriage and denieth His holy love to none, if they, by malice and obstinate perverseness shut not their hands, and refuse to receive it, and so make themselves unworthy of it. . . . Whom hast Thou not invited to Thy holy love, whom hast Thou rejected, and to whom hast Thou denied it *that hath asked it?* Thou art He that saith, 'Come unto Me all ye that labour and are burdened and I will refresh you.' . . . Thou makest Thyself manifest to all, O Lord, and extendest the wings of Thy mercy upon both good and bad, and invitest to Thy holy love both the just and sinners. . . .

"No man can excuse himself before Thy divine Presence if he love Thee not." . . .

January 25th.

I thought I could never look at that book of Michael's again, but yesterday I took it out of its hiding-place and read some of its marked passages. . . . They seemed quite new to me, although I had read them before. Is it because I am beginning to understand? . . .

Yes, yes! After the other night I must believe in that divine, protecting Love. . . . I was saved from myself—saved from committing a crime. . . . The wings of God's Mercy . . . they were folded about me—they are folded about me still!

January 27th.

"As soon as you feel it is possible, Ianthe, will you go to the little church on the moors, the 'House where God lives,' and pray for me as I am praying for you, . . . then we shall meet in our prayers even before we really meet." . . .

That was what Michael said to me in his last letter.

The "House where God lives," how definite that sounds, . . . how beautifully definite. I wonder if Michael is still praying for me—if he knows—if he cares?

January 28th.

At least I have done what he asked me to do—been to his church. . . .

Everything looked the same in the quiet little building as on that August morning when we went there together, and although I was quite alone somehow I didn't feel alone, . . . and the glimmering of the lamp above the altar seemed to just express outwardly that other light which has come to me out of all the dark, horrible, hopeless misery. . . .

And I felt, I knew I was in God's house, that His Presence filled the little quiet place even as it filled the whole universe—but somehow, focussed, brought close, close and near. . . . I felt as one feels when a new day is dawning—when one wonders what that day may be—or perhaps as a blind person feels whose sight is gradually restored. . . .

January 30th.

This morning I went to the church again and knelt again where the steady glow of the altar lamp could be seen. . . . And presently I heard a movement somewhere near, and the old priest, Father Burton, came slowly towards me.

His face looked very kind, very gentle, and benevolent, and I noticed that there was the same look in his blue eyes that I used to notice at times in Michael's eyes—an inner spiritual light shining through the soft blueness. . . .

"Are you in fresh trouble—can I help you in any way?"

He spoke gravely—compassionately, and as he spoke I felt that we were not strangers, that he was my friend.

After that I do not know what he said or what I said, but soon found myself telling him everything, keeping back nothing, nothing, nothing! And not a look of surprise or disapproval came through it all—only a deeper kindness of expression.

"God be thanked that this change has come," I heard him murmur; then he began to speak of Michael's noble death, of other brave men who had been willing—glad to die for the sake of others, and from this he went on to speak of One who had set an example to all mankind and for all time. . . .

He knew that I knew nothing, that I was quite ignorant—practically a pagan—and going back to the beginning told me the story of Jesus Christ as he might have told it to a child, . . . sometimes pointing to one of the pictures hung on the walls to enforce what he was saying—sometimes glancing at the crucifix with eyes full of love and gratitude. . . .

"It was God Himself, my child, who came into this world. . . . And, see, having lived our life He knows all our trials, and temptations, and sorrows. Yes, He knows every inmost trouble of your heart, His love surrounds you every moment, and He alone can lift from you this heavy, weary burden of sin and misery. . . .

"All you have to do is to give yourself to Him entirely—unreservedly—making His will your will—loving Him with all your heart, and soul, and strength." . . .

I do not know how long he talked and prayed with me, but I know I bowed myself in spirit before Incarnate Love. . . .

Emmanuel—God with us! . . .

Jesus, my Jesus. Thou art Love itself. I will bear everything, even Michael's being taken away from me. . . . Jesus, Jesus, Jesus! Thou dost love me and must know best in this as in all things. . . . Thy will shall be my will. . . .

February 14th.

Father Burton has given me the Gospel of St. John, and the light grows more and more dazzlingly bright—but it is impossible to reason about these things—they come to one as the spring comes after winter. . . .

February 24th.

But the Church—the Church of Christ—the living, everlasting Church—the House not made with hands, where God lives eternally? . . .

Father Burton teaches me so patiently, and I begin to understand that the Church on earth is the embodiment—the incarnation, as it were, of that divine, spiritual Church. . . . Visible and invisible. . . . God with us in tangible actuality, . . . the "Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth." . . .

February 25th.

"I am the door. By Me, if any man enter in he shall be saved; and he shall go in, and go out, and shall find pastures." . . .

February 28th.

Strange, wonderful happiness! . . . I have been received into the Church—the Church of Christ. . . .

Jesus, Jesus, Jesus! Thou hast let me in; Thou hast made me one of Thy children, all the past Thou hast forgiven—blotted out. Thou hast led me into Thy pastures. . . . Thou hast baptized me with Thy glorious baptism of water and the

Holy Spirit. . . . Thou hast spoken the awful, tender words of Absolution. . . . Thou hast given me Divine Food—the Bread from Heaven—Thou hast given me Thyself! . . .

Kneeling before Thy minister I saw but Thee, my Maker, Saviour, King. . . .

May 20th.

Once I thought I could never be happy again, but all that is over; the spring has brought me deeper joy than ever before; it is not only that I see so much more in everything about me, the Sun of Heaven, divine, supernatural Love, shining through the veil of earthly things—showing itself in every lovely sight and sound—it is not only this, but somehow I am drawn as I was never drawn before to all the people around me, especially towards those who are in trouble, ill, or unhappy, they are my own brothers and sisters, we are all God's children! . . . Father Burton helps me about this; always tells me if I can be of use anywhere, but it isn't being of use; I care for them, and I think they care for me. . . .

My sick people, my old people, my unhappy, unpleasant people, my babies. . . .

Uncle Julian, too; we are beginning to be so much more to one another than we used to be. . . . Somehow, he is beginning to be dissatisfied, and I do not believe his book the "Origin of Life" will ever be finished—not at least on the old lines—a purely material roadway can never lead anywhere, never—never! Uncle Julian begins to see this, and his uncertainty, doubt, despondency, makes us understand one another as we never did before. . . .

Sun of my soul, light of the world! May Thy Life, may Thy Light, come to him before it is too late. . . . I was blind, quite blind, and now I see—Thy touch hath made me whole—why not another?

CONSTANCE HOPE.

## *Flotsam and Jetsam.*

### **The Round Table Conference.**

THE report of the second Round Table Conference, which took place during the Christmas holidays, has now been published,<sup>1</sup> and contains instructive reading. The subject of the last Conference was The Holy Eucharist, that of the present Conference is Confession and Absolution. The Bishop of London tells us in his Preface that he hesitated for a while between selecting this and The Relation of National Churches to the Church Catholic. One feels a disappointment that this latter subject was not preferred, as being the more fundamental of the two, but perhaps it is only delayed, and in any case the importance of the subject actually chosen is undeniable. The object for which these Round Table Conferences have been undertaken is to ascertain whether, in spite of appearances, the agreement between the opposing schools of thought in the Anglican communion is not more substantial than is supposed. In regard to the Holy Eucharist it could hardly be said that this object had been attained, but the Bishop of London thinks that in the present case the result has been more happy, and he sets down three points as having obtained the assent of all—that the words “Whose sins ye remit,” &c., were not said to the Apostles and clergy only, but as a commission to the whole Church; that the Anglican formularies permit of Confession and Absolution in certain circumstances; that there are no traces of a discipline of private Confession and Absolution in the Early Church. Whether these three points were accepted by all in the same sense he does not say, and it is noticeable that no attempt was made to formulate the general assent in specific resolutions, but at least the opinions expressed have been accurately recorded, and the reader can judge for himself of

<sup>1</sup> *Confession and Absolution.* A Report of a Conference held at Fulham Palace, December, 1901. Edited by Henry Wace, D.D., Chairman of the Conference. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

their bearing. Another object anticipated from the Conference does seem to have been attained, and it is one of great value. Being thus brought together, the representatives of the different phases of opinion were able to appreciate the rectitude of one another's intentions, and to understand better their respective standpoints, and that is always a distinct gain in controversies.

Of the four questions considered—the meaning of our Lord's words in St. Matt. xviii. 18, and St. John xx. 22, 23, the practice of the Church in primitive times and in the middle ages, the meaning and bearing of the Anglican formularies, and the treatment of penitents and the special training of the Minister—the first and fourth were those of the most general interest.

Canon Aitken of Norwich, the principal Evangelical representative, made a somewhat *naïve* acknowledgment, when, referring to the view of the Roman Church that our Lord is in St. John xx. 22, 23, giving then and there to the Apostles the power to forgive sins, he said :

This may seem to be at first a natural and literal interpretation of the words ; but on further consideration, it will be seen to be inadmissible, as it would convey too much. It is incredible that our Lord should have given to any men the right to forgive any one under any conditions. Thus we are obliged to interpret the expression otherwise than literally.

What Canon Aitken considers incredible the vast majority of the Christian world consider both credible and natural, nor did he appear to have anything to oppose to so general a belief save his own *sic volo sic jubeo*. In the alternative interpretations, whether suggested by Canon Aitken or others, what one notices is that they left out of account the clause "whose sins you retain." In a vague, though even then very inadequate, way, the sense of "Go and preach the Gospel" which commended itself to many at the Conference, might fit into the words "Whose sins you forgive they are forgiven," but how in that case are we to understand the words "whose sins you retain they shall be retained"—for no one will suppose that the Apostles were given the power to withhold the preaching of the Gospel?

There seemed to be general agreement that Confession and Absolution do not offer the only way of obtaining divine forgiveness, but in agreeing to this the advocates of Sacramental

Confession got themselves into great difficulties. Here, too, the second clause remained unexplained, for how could there be the power to retain if forgiveness could also be obtained through other channels than priestly absolution? This difficulty, indeed, though serious, was not raised by any one at the Conference. But Canon Aitken asked appropriately:

Does God save people in two ways? Grammar admits exceptions to its rules because they are imperfect; but does God make exceptions? The two ideas are incompatible, that God imparts directly forgiveness to men, and that he imparts it through the medium of their fellow-men.

It is difficult to see how one who acknowledges a Sacrament of Penance, and at the same time holds that men are not under an obligation to have recourse to it, can maintain his ground against Canon Aitken's question. Either we must hold that the way of priestly Absolution is the only way to forgiveness—or at least that there is none other which is not conditioned by the intention to have recourse to this when possible—or else we must hold that this is superfluous and therefore not of divine institution.

The Evangelicals, on the other hand, took up a position which, whatever we may think of it in itself, does at all events allow of this occasional recourse to Confession and Absolution, which all agreed was allowed, and was all that was allowed, by the Anglican formularies. Their theory is that forgiveness is granted to faith, the term being taken to mean an inward assurance of God's readiness to forgive the sinner. On which supposition the minister's ordinary office is to arouse this "faith" by his preaching or other modes of utterance addressed to all hearers collectively. But at times souls laden with sin find it hard to conceive faith of this sort without the additional aid of private interviews, in which they can make known their spiritual state, and receive in return an assurance from the minister that even for one thus burdened the promise avails. What was needful on the High Church side was to point out the assumption involved in supposing that this is what Scripture means by the term "faith," and to claim that the function of the priest, his primary function, at least, is not to give personal assurances of God's promise to forgive, but to be the channel through which by divine appointment the promised forgiveness is conveyed. Lord Halifax did this partially, but he was the only one.



Though, however, the primary reason for going to Confession is to get forgiveness of sin through the one appointed channel, the institution, as might be expected in a work of God, also meets other requirements of the human heart. One of these is that it affords a really effectual means of imparting spiritual guidance to souls in need of it. And here again Lord Halifax very appropriately interposed by citing on this point the testimony of Mr. Keble, who lamented that he had to go blindly about his parish,—not knowing what men were really doing, and whenever he made discoveries finding that they disclosed a fearful state of things. Mr. Keble attributed this to “the neglect of Confession,” in which he saw the “practical failure of the English Church.” That Mr. Keble’s feeling was just, any Catholic priest can realize. All in the Conference would have been with Canon Aitken in feeling the importance of coming into personal contact with sin-burdened souls. But it is hardly too much to say that with the aid of the Confessional a Catholic priest could be brought into useful personal contact with many more such souls in a single month, say in a parish of four or five thousand persons, than an Evangelical minister in ten years.

These are a few out of many interesting points raised in the discussion on which it might have been useful to comment ; for whether it be true or not that substantial agreement or disagreement is the result attained, at least the Conference has succeeded in presenting very strikingly the various phases of Anglican thought in regard to a burning question.

---

#### **Offensive Tactics.**

The strategical advantage admittedly belonging to him who strikes the first blow, is by no means confined to actual warfare. A lawyer of much shrewdness known to the present writer used to say that in cases of collision on the highway, a jury almost invariably decides in favour of the plaintiff, and that accordingly one who knows himself to be flagrantly in the wrong should make haste to take the initiative and bring an action against the man he has injured, if he does not wish to pay the penalty of his own negligence or want of skill. A policy of similar character appears to regulate the action of many controversialists with whom we come in contact—and, so far as practical effectiveness goes, it is certainly justified of its works.

An assailant of the Church, or the Papacy, or Religious Orders in general, or Jesuits in particular, begins by roundly making a statement to their discredit. He eschews anything in the way of a proof upon which his assertion might be supposed to rest, and which would be capable of discussion or refutation, thus leaving nothing of which an adversary can get hold. Having done this, he assumes that by the mere fact of making a statement it is he that holds the field, and may claim to hold it until some one shall have conclusively demonstrated the falsehood of his tale. It never seems to occur to him, nor indeed to the multitude of readers, that the burden of proof rests on the man who makes a positive assertion, and that nothing is more unfair than to expect somebody else to prove a negative.

Examples are not far to seek. A writer declares that the wealthy Jesuits subsidize the Pope and the *Curia*, and have consequently undue influence in the government of the Church. The statement is given the lie direct by one who is in a position to know the truth of such a matter, and who challenges the production of any tittle of evidence in its support. The only reply he gets is that his curiosity concerning the evidence shall certainly *not* be gratified, but that the assertion shall none the less be maintained; and so its author rides off as though in triumph.

Again: a correspondent of a prominent weekly journal declares that all Jesuits take the preposterous Oath which twelve months ago was figuring in our newspapers. Thereupon a Jesuit of long-standing writes to say that such an Oath was never taken by any member of the Order. Is he met with anything to substantiate the definite and categorical assertion originally made? Nothing of the sort. The man who made it feels himself entitled to assume an air of superiority, and sarcastically asks how one Jesuit can be so positive about all others. He apparently has no notion that upon himself the *onus probandi* lies.

Once more. It is asserted that an objectionable French newspaper, the *Libre Parole*, was founded by a Jesuit agent, with Jesuit money, and that it is conducted by Jesuit writers. To no purpose is it pointed out again and again, that although one of the persons engaged in this concern had at one time a business connection with the Society, this had been broken off some years before the paper came into existence; while it is categorically denied that either a penny of Jesuit money

or the smallest scrap of Jesuit assistance has been given to it. No attempt whatever is made to contradict or refute such denials, or to establish the grave allegations made. No notice is even taken of the fact that there have been denials. The calumny is in possession and holds serenely on its course, —reiteration lending it strength in default of demonstration—and, like Milton's day-star

He tricks his beams and with new spangled ore,  
Flames in the forehead of the morning sky,

or, in other words, continues to illumine the public mind in the columns of our morning papers.

A particularly flagrant example of the manner in which "information" is thus brewed for the English market has lately been furnished in the columns of a London journal of recognized position. In the *Daily Chronicle* of March 3rd, Sir H. Gilzean-Reid, LL.D.—writing as from his own personal observation—thus speaks of the state of things in Spain, which he declares to be almost desperate :

This terrible Nemesis is largely attributed, and only too truly, to the systematic extortions and oppression of the Catholic orders—especially the great Order of the Jesuits—which hold tramways, public houses, shares in manufacturing and trading concerns and other vast possessions, and with which the multitude are now, as ever, in bitter conflict. Catholic against Catholic is a form of antagonism which it is difficult for outsiders to understand, but it is made painfully explicit to those who have been able to look behind the scenes. It is not for nothing that there may be seen to-day—as could be seen twelve and six months ago—hostile processions, with banners bearing such mottoes as "Down with the Monasteries," "Expulsion of the Jesuits," or, as I once saw, "Deliver us from the tyranny of the priesthood." Though the strongest opponents frankly acknowledge honourable exceptions, it is a deplorable story as one often hears it told all over the land, amongst rich and poor, Catholic and anti-Cleric almost alike. The allegations are to be heard everywhere—the secret and insidious interference with domestic affairs : wielding perverting influence over women, and appropriating the fortunes of families ; ruinous exactions : undermining political and municipal administration—a relentless and selfish rule, permeating every sphere of life, and exercising a dangerous and demoralizing power. Of a truth, "the worm" has turned, and has been showing for some time past that if the all-prevailing oppression and injustice cannot be speedily removed by constitutional means, it will be met and combated with stones and revolvers and blood-stained riot.

This is no doubt the sort of thing of which we have all heard time out of mind under many varying circumstances

of time and place. Wishing, however, to ascertain what materials are afforded for such a picture in the country whose condition is professedly described, we have applied to a friend in Madrid—who is, it is true, one of those denounced as miscreants, but on that very account may be supposed to know how things really are. He replies :

So this is the kind of thing to which credit is attached in your country? In our own, no one would trouble himself to refute such trash. Calumnies of this description, so baseless and inane, are held by men of education as beneath contempt, and as the monopoly of the lowest dregs of the populace. It seems, in fact, that they have lost their attraction even for these, as appeared recently in the labour troubles at Barcelona, where, whilst workmen were at war with their employers, no voices were raised against the Jesuits.

Here is a pretty categorical contradiction. We do not say that this second version of the story should at once be accepted rather than the first without further evidence ; but surely until something in the way of evidence shall be produced it has no less right to be heard. Manifestly, too, it is for Sir H. Gilzean-Reid to substantiate the charges he has chosen to bring. These being so gross and grievous as we have seen, it should not be difficult to procure something at least in the way of demonstration—especially as “Liberal” and anti-Clerical statesmen have had power in their hands so long. But that he will attempt practically to recognize any such obligation we do not anticipate.

---

#### **Pope Pius IV. and the Book of Common Prayer.**

Illustrations of the style in which history is manufactured for anti-Catholic purposes are unusually plentiful just now, but it is not often that we come across one so delightfully simple in method, as was recently furnished in the columns of the *Daily News*.<sup>1</sup> A representative of that newspaper called upon the redoubtable Secretary of the Protestant Alliance, Mr. S.W. Brett, in order to hear his views regarding the monkish invasion with which our unhappy country is threatened, the measures which it is proposed to take in self-defence, and all the rest of it. The whole question, Mr. Brett assured his interviewer, is purely political, not religious ; the Catholic Church is always chiefly concerned with political power, and the present is but one phase of the everlasting struggle “between the Crozier and the

<sup>1</sup> November 11, 1901.

Crown." In support of these assertions, he quoted the following bit of history: (The italics are ours.)

Long ago the Pope offered to confirm the English Book of Common Prayer if Elizabeth would but recognize and restore his *political* supremacy in this country. *This fact is stated by Camden, in his Annals*, and the claim to political power has never been abandoned, &c.

Camden's *Annals* may, however, be consulted for themselves by those who choose to take a very little trouble; and this is what they tell us<sup>1</sup> concerning the mission of Vincent Parpalia to Elizabeth by Pius IV. (1560):

*What Parpalia proposed I have not learnt, and I do not believe there is any written record; while I am most unwilling to do what historians generally do, and invent.* Everybody knows that Elizabeth was like herself, and that things did not go as the Pope desired. *Rumour has it* that the Pontiff engaged himself to revoke the condemnation of her mother's marriage, as being unjust—to confirm by his authority the Anglican liturgy, and to allow the use of the Sacrament in England under both kinds—if only the Queen would unite herself with the Church and recognize the primacy of the Roman See.

So, what Camden says is that nothing is known *as a fact*, and even the popular rumour which he mentions without accepting, says nothing whatever of *political* power. Yet the Secretary of the Protestant Alliance, after rebuking the exiled French religious for not "working in the spirit of the Founder of Christianity," calmly endeavours to foist upon the public his gross perversion of the historian whom he professes to quote.

#### Deipara, or "Equal to God."

Readers of Cardinal Newman's inimitable *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics* will probably suppose that he is but indulging in a characteristic stroke of humour when he makes the representative Protestant silence all objections against Catholic worship of the Virgin Mary by triumphantly arguing, "Why, they call her *Deipara*, which means 'equal to God.'"

It would, however, appear that there was no need to draw on the imagination for such a rendering, which had been gravely produced—along with much more of like character—as furnishing a motive against any concession of the Catholic claims, in the days when Emancipation was in the air. This we learn from a speech delivered in the House of Commons by

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 72.

Mr. Spring Rice, afterwards Lord Monteagle, March 9, 1829, in which he said :

In a book lately published on the present state of Italy, and dedicated, by a singular coincidence, to the hon. baronet, the member for the University of Oxford,<sup>1</sup> the author, some exclusive Protestant, had stated that he found in one of the towns through which he passed, the following inscription :—*In honorem beatæ et deiparæ Virginis*, which he had thus translated, " In honour of the Blessed Virgin co-equal with God," terming it a shocking piece of blasphemy.

Once more is truth found to be more wonderful than any fiction.

---

### *Reviews.*

#### I.—AN APPRECIATION OF CARDINAL NEWMAN.<sup>2</sup>

THE extraordinary spell which Cardinal Newman could throw upon men is evidently still effective, more than a century after his birth, and a decade since he passed from amongst us. Neither is it confined to those who either share his mother-tongue, or are united by that faith which for him was the one great reality of life. In France, for instance, a regular school of his admirers appears now first to be forming, whilst for our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen the little book before us is not the only evidence that the interest aroused by his personality and his career is still keen.

Messrs. Waller and Burrow thus describe the object they have in view :

In this brief biography we have endeavoured to give an impression of Cardinal Newman's mind in its main characteristics, and to provide such an objective setting and so much narration of events as should make its development plain. We have, as far as possible, used materials other than those to be found in the *Apologia*, in the hope that this little book might provide illustrations to that great book,—illustrations which hitherto have been scattered through many volumes.

This object has evidently been pursued with all sincerity. It is equally clear that the writers entertain a sincere esteem and even admiration for their hero ; and yet we cannot but think that they fall far short of its attainment.

They are, in the first place, quite out of sympathy with what Newman would himself undoubtedly have considered as of

<sup>1</sup> Sir R. H. Inglis, a vehement opponent of Emancipation.

<sup>2</sup> "The Westminster Biographies." *John Henry Cardinal Newman.* By A. R. Waller and G. H. S. Burrow. Pp. xvii. 150. London : Kegan Paul.

supreme importance in his career. Indeed their interest in him seems to flag after his conversion, as would appear from the fact that of the 147 pages of which (apart from a bibliography) their work consists, 37 suffice for the forty-four years subsequent to his conversion. The natural result of this is that they seem in great measure to miss the significance of that which chiefly occupies their attention, namely the history of his mind whilst he struggled forward to his ultimate goal. Certainly we do not think that a reader would gather from their pages (79, 80) any true idea of the awful crisis when, as he himself tells us, he saw a ghost, the shadow of a hand upon the wall, when the heavens opened and for a moment the thought first flashed upon his mind that the Church of Rome would be found right after all. Similarly, our writers appear to be wholly unable to appreciate the works in which Newman sets himself to draw out the line of thought which leads on a soul to faith. Of *Callista*, they utter the marvellous judgment :<sup>1</sup>

Although it contains characteristic passages, yet, had he never resumed the work after the first pause, imaginative literature, it is to be supposed, could have borne the loss with patience.

Still worse is the case of *Loss and Gain*, in which more than any other of his works, the *Apologia* alone excepted, is a record to be sought of the path which he himself so painfully and so resolutely trod. Upon it they pronounce a criticism which at least shows them to be by no means lacking in courage.<sup>2</sup>

It contains [they say] passages of real pathos, of lasting beauty, . . . of grotesque humour, and many keenly remembered details of Oxford life, *but is wholly spoiled by chapters ix. and x., which, as presented to the reader, are incredible as fact and ridiculous as literature.*

Such a verdict naturally excites our curiosity, which however we do not find it easy to gratify. What is meant by "chapters ix. and x."? There are three parts to the story, each of which has its own separate numeration of chapters, so that there are three pairs of ix's and x's. Nor does an examination of their contents enable us to determine which of them contains the matter pronounced to be "incredible as fact and ridiculous as literature." In Part I., c. 9 has Dr. Brownside's delightful sermon, and c. 10, Mr. Vincent, the tutor's, breakfast party. The corresponding chapters in Part II. narrate the undergraduate hero's difficulties with his Vice-Principal. In c. 9 of Part III. he has, on the eve of his conversion, his last

<sup>1</sup> P. 121.<sup>2</sup> P. 114.



painful conference with his father's old friend, Mr. Malcolm, while c. 10 contains that description of the Benediction service which some place amongst the finest things which even Cardinal Newman ever wrote. What then do our critics mean? It is moreover somewhat disquieting to find that they who can speak so confidently call the hero of the book<sup>1</sup> "Charles Rising," instead of "Reding," and even more so, to learn their opinion of the marvellous gift of humour, keen delicate and trenchant, which Newman handled so masterfully.

His keen observation [they write],<sup>2</sup> of even trivial or personal matters, which in after life gave to his religious teaching so much of its reality, was already at work [in 1848!]<sup>3</sup> accompanied by a certain sense of humour, sometimes running into the grotesque.

Nor do the authors appear to us more successful when they enter the field of philosophy, as when they endeavour to show<sup>4</sup> that Newman overstated the difficulty concerning the ascent from reason to faith, or present us<sup>5</sup> with a sketch of *The Grammar of Assent*. In neither case do they seem to have grasped the questions with which they essay to deal.

It might also be asked whether it is quite accurate to speak<sup>6</sup> of the Cardinal's likeness to "The Roman Emperor," when the person intended is Julius Cæsar.

While, therefore, we fully recognize the excellence of the motive which has prompted this tribute and presented it in so attractive a form, we cannot think that it will afford much assistance to such as desire rightly to appreciate our great Cardinal.

## 2.—THE TRUE JOAN OF ARC.<sup>7</sup>

The story of Joan of Arc belongs unfortunately almost as much to English history as it does to the history of France, and the magnificent work of Père Ayroles, which represents the most elaborate attempt to do justice to her memory on the part of any writer distinctively Catholic, deserves to the full as much attention as has already been accorded in this country to the publications of Quicherat and Siméon Luce. It is much to be feared, however, that on this side of the Channel,

<sup>1</sup> P. 14.

<sup>2</sup> P. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Loss and Gain* was written in this year.

<sup>4</sup> P. 39.

<sup>5</sup> P. 136.

<sup>6</sup> P. 72.

<sup>7</sup> *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc*, vol. v. *La Martyre*. By J. B. Ayroles. Paris: Vitte, 1902. *L'Université de Paris au Temps de Jeanne d'Arc*. Par le même. Paris: Rondelet, 1902.

*La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc* will be read only by a comparatively narrow circle. For one thing, the bulk of the undertaking is likely to prove rather a serious deterrent to purchasers. Five stout volumes, imperial 8vo, with maps and plans, are not by any means a dear investment at the subscription price of fifty francs for the set, but like other works of the class, the volumes need binding, and as we gather from the Preface of vol. 5, a General Index is to follow, not to speak of the Supplement on Joan of Arc and the University of Paris which has already reached us. Again, with only a few exceptions of no great moment, the documents which fill Père Ayroles' pages have been published already by Quicherat or others, and serious students will usually prefer to have the ancient texts in their native form as Quicherat gives them, rather than in the translated or modernized version of Père Ayroles. For all that, *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc* must be regarded as a really great monument erected to the honour of one of the most noble figures of mediæval history. We can pardon Père Ayroles all his enthusiasm for his heroine, and much even of the strong language which he bestows on those whom he regards as her calumniators, for the sake of the thrilling interest which belongs to the work in its more narrative portions. He is evidently master of his subject and familiar with every detail, and the very iteration with which in different volumes he comes back upon the same fact according to the need of his argument, is not without its recommendation for those who read his volumes separately.

The present and concluding instalment of the main work is called *La Martyre*, and we must own that in the matter of this same title we find no little difficulty in bringing ourselves to the point of view of the author. The volume is concerned with the history of the trial and death of the Maid, and we at first supposed that the heading was only used loosely in the sense in which those who lay down their lives in any good cause, whether it be patriotism or charity or science, are popularly described as martyrs. But it appears that Père Ayroles means more than this. He hopes that some day Joan, the deliverer of her country, will be venerated as *Virgo et Martyr*, and that in her honour may be used the red vestments consecrated to those who have shed their blood for the faith of Christ. It would take us too far to discuss the elaborate theological argument upon which this contention is based. We will only say that according to the principles which he

adopts, the popular conception of a martyr in the stricter sense, as one put to death *in odium fidei*, would have to be seriously modified. During the prevalence of the witch mania, many poor victims must have suffered death at the hands of the Inquisitors, who might have saved their lives had they but professed repentance for crimes of which they had not been guilty. Père Ayroles' argument would show that in not a few such cases a claim to the honours of martyrdom might be made out which would fulfil all technical requirements. And what is to be said of such an instance as that of the visionary Pierronne? This is how the so-called "Bourgeois de Paris" speaks of her in his Journal :

Also the third of September (1430), on a Sunday, two women, who about half a year before had been captured at Corbeil and brought to Paris, had a sermon preached over them in the court before Notre Dame. The elder of these was Pierronne, and she was from Bretagne speaking Breton. She asserted and maintained that dame Joan (the Maid), who fought for the Armagnacs, was a good woman, and that what she did was well done and according to God.

Also she admitted having received the precious Body of our Lord twice in one day. Also she asserted and swore that God often appeared to her (obviously Pierronne) in human form, and spoke to her as one friend speaks to another, and that the last time she had seen Him, He was clad in a long white robe with a crimson doublet (*hucque*) under it ; which is nothing short of blasphemy. And she would never retract this statement that she often sees God clothed in this form, for the which, on this same day, she was sentenced to be burned, and so it was done, and she died on the Sunday named, persisting in this assertion, but the other woman was set at liberty at the same time.<sup>1</sup>

An impostor does not face death to maintain a conscious fraud, and it seems to us that from the point of view of laying down her life in defence of a dictate of conscience, Pierronne's technical claim to the designation of martyr is as good as Joan's. But for all that it would surely run counter to the *sensus fidelium* if all such sufferers, whether inspired or deluded, were to be adjudged worthy of beatification.

The extract just quoted may serve also to recall what seems to us the most serious defect of Père Ayroles' work, his constitutional inability to enter into the point of view of anyone who disagrees with him. Whether he is dealing with the Burgundians of the fifteenth century, or with the non-Catholic writers of our own day, Père Ayroles makes no allowances for the effects of prejudice or previous training. The existence of an honest

<sup>1</sup> *Le Bourgeois*, pp. 259, 260.

detractor of the Maid is treated as a self-evident impossibility, and the rationalists who doubt the supernatural character of her mission are all, in his view, inspired with hatred or malice. Of his tone in dealing with such writers as Quicherat and Siméon Luce, we will not say more than we have already done in reviewing the earlier volumes of *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc*. But we cannot pass over in silence his treatment of the valued authority just cited, the so-called "Bourgeois," whom he nick-names *le parfait clerc*. So far as we know, there is absolutely nothing to be alleged against the "Bourgeois," except that he was a Burgundian in sympathy, and, like the majority of the University and the citizens of Paris, was inclined to look favourably upon the English alliance. His diary of nearly forty years sets him before us as a thoroughly good priest; a pious, honest, and singularly candid observer, but because he happens to echo the disrespectful language common at that date among English and Burgundians in speaking of the Maid, Père Ayroles treats him with uniform contempt, and speaks of him as a very monster of malignity.

The learned editor of the *Cartularium*, Father Denifle, O.P., has to our thinking most justly cast doubt upon the identification of the "Bourgeois" with Jean Chuffart, the Chancellor of the University. Father Denifle's objections are very ill presented in Ayroles' *Université* (p. 88), and we may own in passing that the author is not seen to advantage in other criticisms upon the *Cartularium* upon which he has there ventured. Of course to Père Ayroles the "Bourgeois" is a most unwelcome witness; but why he should be so keen to maintain that no honest Frenchman, either before or after the ecclesiastical enquiry and sentence, could believe Joan an impostor, is to us a mystery.

For after all there was surely justification for the men of those days if they were at times a little suspicious of the reality of revelations and prophecies. We have just spoken of Pierronne, but she was not the only visionary who seems to have been inspired by emulation of the Maid. There is the curious history of Friar Richard and Catharine of La Rochelle, for our knowledge of which we are indebted not merely to the "Bourgeois" but to depositions of Joan herself. Friar Richard had come to preach in Paris in the April of 1429. The "Bourgeois," whose notes were obviously written down in his journal at the time, tells us much of the extraordinary effect produced by these sermons, recalling both in their prophetic character and in their results what we read fifty years later of

the preaching of Savonarola. Within three or four hours of one of these discourses he tells us, a hundred fires had been lighted in different parts of the city, into which people cast various articles of vanity and the apparatus of gambling.

The ten sermons [says the "Bourgeois" again] delivered by Friar Richard, in Paris, converted more people to piety than all the preachers who had preached here for a hundred years before.

Before the end of April the Friar disappeared from Paris rather mysteriously, and in time rumours came that he had joined the army of the Maid, and was assisting her by his preaching to persuade different cities of France to open their gates to Charles VII. In July the "Bourgeois" writes :

It was discovered that, true enough, the cordelier who gathered such crowds at his sermons, as was noted above, was riding for sure with the Armagnacs. As soon as the people of Paris were certain that he had joined them, and that by his sermons he was drawing over to that side the towns which had sworn an oath to the Regent of France or his delegates, they cursed him by God and the saints, and what is worse, merely to spite him, they began again the gaming with tables, and balls, and dice, in a word, everything which he had forbidden. They even cast away a pewter medal, upon which was inscribed the name of Jesus, which he had made them take, and all of them took the cross of St. Andrew.

Now either this is a pure invention, which even Père Ayroles does not suggest, or else it proves that not only the University magnates, but the people of Paris, were bitterly hostile to the cause of Charles VII. some months before the Maid, on September 8th, chose a festival day to deliver an assault upon their walls. That Friar Richard was the ordinary director of Joan, as well as of Pierronne, and of Catharine of La Rochelle, is no doubt a calumny of the Dominican Inquisitor who preached in Paris after the Maid's cruel death. On the other hand Joan certainly went to confession to Friar Richard before Senlis at the feast of the Assumption, he assisted her by his eloquence in procuring the surrender of the townspeople of Troyes and he is alleged to have helped to hold her standard beside the altar on the occasion of the sacring at Rheims. None the less, Friar Richard is for Père Ayroles, *l'extravagant cordelier*. We have no wish to quarrel with the epithet, but if the apostle was judged extravagant, why not also Joan who was associated with him. He was undoubtedly the director of the other visionary, the Catharine of La Rochelle already

mentioned. This Catharine professed to be visited at night by a certain white lady robed in cloth of gold ; and Friar Richard wished Joan to follow the advice given by Catharine regarding the collection of funds for the war. Joan deposed at her trial that her saints warned her that the visions of this Catharine were a delusion, and she (Joan) moreover slept with her two nights to watch for the appearance of her white lady but saw nothing. Friar Richard was very displeased because the Maid would pay no heed to the advice of his penitent, and he seems thereafter to have sided with the latter and to have gone away in her company.

There is nothing in all this which conflicts in the least with the sincerity of Joan and the really supernatural character of the voices by which she was guided—quite the contrary ; still there must have been at least sufficient foundation to give colour to the assertions of the Dominican, Graverent, after Joan's death that there had been four of these visionaries, all under the direction of Friar Richard, three of whom had already been disposed of by ecclesiastical authority. The fourth, Catharine of La Rochelle, was, he stated, still with the Armagnacs and she pretended that at the moment of consecration she beheld the hidden mysteries of God in the Blessed Sacrament. What is more, no sooner had Joan disappeared from the scene, than there was brought forward under the patronage of the Archbishop of Rheims, a half-witted shepherd-lad, who was alleged to bear the stigmata and to be charged with a fresh message from Heaven in support of the French cause.

If we have insisted somewhat upon these points it is not most assuredly with the design of detracting in any way from the glory of one of the noblest characters in history, but only because we do not consider that that glory is enhanced by representing all the adversaries of the Maid as so many fiends incarnate. Bedford, the Regent, was a good, and, regard being had to the rude manners of the times, a reasonably humane man. It may possibly be true that great indirect pressure was brought to bear by the English through Warwick to secure a condemnation, but this only appears in the process of twenty year later, when the witnesses, the survivors of the former assessors, were obviously eager to shift the blame from themselves upon the dead and absent, especially the English. What is certain is that Bedford, Beaufort, Warwick, Stafford, and the other English commanders were not present at those examinations,

the record of which now makes the beautiful sincerity of Joan so patent to our eyes. No official copy of these interrogatories was delivered to the English Government until long after the tragedy was over. Save for the occasional presence of Heaton, and still more rarely one or two other English clerics, the judges, assessors, prosecutors, secretaries, amounting in sum to a hundred and twenty persons, were indisputably Frenchmen, and the University of Paris, with which, as Père Ayroles declares, the responsibility for the crime mainly rests, was represented by some of its most distinguished sons. We would not for a moment wish to extenuate the infamy of the sentence by which the innocent Maid was condemned to a shameful death, and we recognize it as a blot which must for ever stain the memory of English rule in France, but saving for such men as Cauchon and a few others among her judges, who day after day were the spectators of her demeanour under cross-examination, we consider it possible that most of the English and Burgundians may in all sincerity have believed her to be a sorceress in league with the powers of evil.

The damning fact for contemporaries was no doubt her costume. If England, *absit omen*, were in our own day once more to go to war with France, and it became known that a peasant-girl in male attire was acting as first-lieutenant of the most successful of our cruisers, I think it would need a good deal of evidence to convince our opponents that she was any better than a baggage. And the ready belief of the middle ages in witchcraft and diabolical impersonations, together with the far from rare occurrences of deluded visionaries claiming prophetic powers, will not have made the decision easier. Ten years after the death of Joan, the famous German Dominican John Nider, the author of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, was plainly unable to make up his mind whether she was saint or sorceress. He inclined on the whole to the latter alternative. Is it wonderful that the English and Burgundians, smarting from defeat and stung by the Maid's bold prophecy<sup>1</sup> of their final overthrow, should have judged the cause more hastily and fiercely than the impartial Nider?

If we have seemed in some respects to dissent from Father Ayroles' conclusions, let us hasten in taking our leave of him to

<sup>1</sup> If we may trust Aymond de Macy, a witness in the rehabilitation process, Joan told Warwick and Stafford to their face that though the English brought 100,000 more "Goddons" (God-damns—a contemptuous nickname for the English) into the country, they would never hold it against the French King.



do justice to the good faith and comprehensiveness of his work. He has certainly no thought of suppressing any evidence which may help the reader to form an opinion. His own pages supply practically all the materials a critic can require. Moreover, we are satisfied that many of his animadversions upon Quicherat and other modern writers are well founded in substance. It is partly because we believe that such corrections would be more effective if more dispassionately stated that we have called attention to the matter here.

---

### 3.—A FEW FIRST PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIFE.<sup>1</sup>

Persons living in "Holy Matrimony and Single Blessedness" are indebted to Father Reginald Buckler, O.P., for several pages of sound reading and advice given in a little pamphlet so named and in his *Good Practical Catholic. A Few First Principles of Religious Life* is written for the use of religious men and women, especially for novices. It is a short and clear, but comprehensive exposition of the idea and scope of religious life and the perfection at which it aims. "Perfect charity is the End of the Religious Life." The means for attaining it are the knowledge of God and self, prayer and mortification of selfish as opposed to Divine love, the vows, the rules and the works of daily life.

Not unfrequently members of religious Sisterhoods, whose "works of daily life" are of incalculable importance for the interests of the Church and of souls, are tempted to imagine that ordinary daily work is prejudicial rather than conducive to holiness and religious perfection. To such, and to the important Catholic interests affected by their work, the author has done a real service, in making it clear how not only their vows and rules, their mortifications and devotional exercises, but all "the works of daily life" can easily be made means and helps "for attaining the end of perfect charity" and for the constant practice of the highest perfection. "Charity does not cause the loss of charity. And so, if a soul lives with God within, it must not think it a losing game to go forth to outer works, and attend lovingly to the needs of others."

<sup>1</sup> *A Few First Principles of Religious Life.* A Spiritual Instruction to Religious Men and Women. By Father H. Reginald Buckler, O.P. Price Sixpence net, pp. 52. London: Burns and Oates.

## *Literary Record.*

### I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

IT is by the study of concrete "cases of conscience," that the young Levite is taught to grasp firmly the principles of Moral Theology, and, therefore, Father Lehmkuhl, whose two volumes on Moral Theology have proved such favourites in theological seminaries throughout the world, has determined to follow them up with two volumes of *Casus Conscientiæ* (Herder), of which the first has just appeared. The cases are arranged to correspond with the sections of the *Theologia Moralis*, are much more numerous than in Gury's collection, amounting to two hundred and eighty-three in this one volume. It is not necessary to say more about these cases and solutions, than that the former will be found to cover a wide range of matter, and the latter are marked by the clearness and moderation which his readers have learned to expect from Father Lehmkuhl.

Fresh stories of the class which, though not of any very high literary pretensions, aim at interesting young people and nourishing them on healthy sentiments, will be in demand as long as the generations of young people continue. Of this class are *Life's Labyrinth* (Notre Dame, Indiana), and *As True as Gold* (Benziger), by Miss Mary Mannix; *Mary Tracy's Fortune* (Benziger), by Miss Anna T. Sadlier; *Brunt and Bill* (Benziger), by Miss Clara Mulholland; *Recruit Tommy Collins* (Benziger), by Miss Mary Bonesteel—all writers with whom the young Catholics of America are familiar. *Corinne's Vow* (Benziger), by Miss M. Waggaman, is a book of the same kind, but is of a somewhat higher quality and has numerous illustrations.

*The Last Voice of the Old Hierarchy*, is a speech made by Bishop Scott of Chester, one of the Marian Bishops, in the first Parliament of Elizabeth. It has been thought by the Catholic Truth Society worthy of publication in tract form, as giving such an excellent *resumé* of the points on which the claims of the Holy See rest, points which, then as now, are the same. *The Carmelites of Compiègne* (C.T.S.), which appeared originally in

THE MONTH, is by the Comtesse de Courson, and is an account of the very touching martyrdom of a community of Carmelite nuns during the Revolution. *The Mass, an aid to understand it* (C.T.S.), is by Father W. A. Beadon. On the *recto* pages it gives an analysis of the different parts of the Mass, on the *verso* pages a short explanation which seeks to elucidate the sacrificial character of the rite.

## II.—MAGAZINES.

### *Some contents of foreign Periodicals :*

LES ÉTUDES RELIGIEUSES. (March 5 and 20.)

An ill-starred Law (Primary Education in Belgium). *P. Castillon.*

On the training of the Religious Sense. *H. Bremond.*

The French National Debt. *J. Massabuau.* General

Bertrand in 1813. *H. Chérot.* The Jesus Christ of

Professor Harnack. *L. de Grandmaison.* The Victims

of Messidor. *P. Dudon.* Reviews, &c.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (March 1 and 15.)

Christian Democracy and the Holy See. Pius VII. and Joachim

Murat. The Christian Fathers of the Church of Alex-

andria. The Principles of Historical Criticism. Queen

Mary Stuart and the Holy See. The authenticity of

the *Monita Secreta.*

RAZÓN Y FE. (March, 1902.)

Christian Democracy. *N. Noguér.* A New Philosophical Theory

of Transubstantiation: *M. Martínez.* The Marquess de

Mora. *L. Coloma.* Botanical Rambles in Galicia.

*R. Morino.*

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (March 14.)

Queen Mary Stuart and the Holy See. *O. Pfülf.* The Early

History of Christian Names. *C. A. Kneller.* Chateau-

briand's *Apology for Christianity.* *A. Baumgartner.*

The Sistine Chapel. *J. Hilgers.* Reviews, &c.

L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE. (March.)

Organ and Function in the System of Evolution. *A. Dounadiou.*

The Letters of M. Guizot. *Abbé Delfour.* Charles

Chesnelong. *M. de Marcey.* Dante Alighieri. *P. Fontaine.*

Reviews, &c.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. (March, 1902.)

Apologetics and Dogma. *F. T. Lloyd.* Sanatio in Radice.

*J. Putzer, C.S.S.R.* Amovibility *Ad Nutum.* *A. Kroll.*

Rabbinical Studies. *W. H. Kent.* Reviews, &c.

